



European  
Commission

# JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

DCF ECONOMIC DATA CALL 2012

COVERAGE REPORT

JRC G.04 FISHREG Data Collection Team

REPORT EUR 25449 EN

*Joint  
Research  
Centre*

European Commission  
Joint Research Centre  
Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

#### Further information

<https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>  
<http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>  
<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>  
<http://fishreg.jrc.ec.europa.eu/>

Contact: [datasubmission@jrc.ec.europa.eu](mailto:datasubmission@jrc.ec.europa.eu)

#### Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area.

Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers to your questions about the European Union

Freephone number (\*): 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(\*) Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers or these calls may be billed.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.

It can be accessed through the Europa server <http://europa.eu/>

JRC73232

EUR 25449 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-25747-6

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/39550

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2012

© European Union, 2012

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Italy

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES .....	2
1. SUMMARY .....	5
2. INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND .....	7
3. ECONOMIC DATA CALL CONTENTS .....	8
4. QUALITY AND COVERAGE CHECKING PROCEDURES .....	10
5. OVERALL EVALUATION .....	12
6. COUNTRY BY COUNTRY EVALUATION .....	21
6.1 Belgium .....	21
6.2 Bulgaria .....	25
6.3 Cyprus .....	28
6.4 Denmark .....	31
6.5 Estonia .....	34
6.6 Finland .....	37
6.7 France .....	40
6.8 Germany .....	44
6.9 Greece .....	48
6.10 Ireland .....	49
6.11 Italy .....	52
6.12 Latvia .....	56
6.13 Lithuania .....	59
6.14 Malta .....	62
6.15 The Netherlands .....	65
6.16 Poland .....	68
6.17 Portugal .....	71
6.18 Romania .....	74
6.19 Slovenia .....	77
6.20 Spain .....	80
6.21 Sweden .....	83
6.22 United Kingdom .....	87
7. APPENDICES .....	91
APPENDIX A. ....	92
APPENDIX B. ....	123

## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 3.1 Requirements for 2012 DCF Fleet Economic data call. ....	9
Figure 5.1 Member States uploading activity in response to the 2012 call for economic data .....	15
Figure 5.2 Fleet Economic data call coverage overview by Member State: At deadline (9 March 2012).....	16
Figure 5.3 Fleet Economic data call coverage overview by Member State: Current situation (1 July 2012) ....	17
Table 5.1 Summary of missing data/outstanding issues .....	18
Table 5.2 Summary of Member States sampling strategies in 2008-2012 .....	20
Table 6.1.1 Date of uploads for Belgium .....	21
Table 6.1.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Belgium 2008-2012 .....	22
Table 6.1.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Belgium 2008-2012 .....	23
Table 6.1.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Belgium .....	23
Table 6.1.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Belgium .....	24
Table 6.2.1 Date of uploads for Bulgaria .....	25
Table 6.2.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Bulgaria 2008-2012 .....	26
Table 6.2.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Bulgaria 2008-2012.....	26
Table 6.2.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Bulgaria .....	27
Table 6.2.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Bulgaria .....	27
Table 6.3.1 Date of uploads for Cyprus.....	28
Table 6.3.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Cyprus 2008-2012. ....	29
Table 6.3.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Cyprus 2008-2012. ....	29
Table 6.3.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Cyprus .....	30
Table 6.3.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Cyprus .....	30
Table 6.4.1 Date of uploads for Denmark.....	31
Table 6.4.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Denmark 2008-2011.....	32
Table 6.4.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Denmark 2008-2010. ....	32
Table 6.4.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Denmark .....	33
Table 6.4.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Denmark .....	33
Table 6.5.1 Date of uploads for Estonia.....	34
Table 6.5.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Estonia 2005-2012.....	35
Table 6.5.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Estonia 2008-2011. ....	35
Table 6.5.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Estonia .....	36
Table 6.6.1 Date of uploads for Finland.....	37
Table 6.6.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Finland 2008-2011.....	38
Table 6.6.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Finland 2008-2010. ....	38
Table 6.6.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Finland .....	39
Table 6.7.1 Date of uploads for France.....	40
Table 6.7.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for France 2008-2010.....	41
Table 6.7.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for France 2008-2010. ....	42
Table 6.7.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by France .....	43
Table 6.8.1 Date of uploads for Germany.....	44
Table 6.8.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Germany 2008-2012.....	45
Table 6.8.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Germany 2008-2012. ....	46
Table 6.8.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Germany .....	47
Table 6.10.1 Date of uploads for Ireland .....	49
Table 6.10.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Ireland 2008-2012 .....	50
Table 6.10.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Ireland 2008-2012.....	50
Table 6.10.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Ireland.....	51
Table 6.11.1 Date of uploads for Italy.....	52
Table 6.11.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Italy 2008-2011 .....	53
Table 6.11.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Italy 2008-2011. ....	54
Table 6.11.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Italy .....	54
Table 6.11.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Italy .....	55

Table 6.12.1 Date of uploads for Latvia .....	56
Table 6.12.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Latvia 2008-2012 .....	56
Table 6.12.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Latvia 2008-2012. ....	57
Table 6.12.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Latvia .....	57
Table 6.12.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Latvia.....	58
Table 6.13.1 Date of uploads for Lithuania.....	59
Table 6.13.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Lithuania 2004-2011.....	60
Table 6.13.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Lithuania 2008-2011. ....	60
Table 6.13.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Lithuania .....	61
Table 6.13.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Lithuania .....	61
Table 6.14.1 Date of uploads for Malta .....	62
Table 6.14.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Malta 2005-2012 .....	63
Table 6.14.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Malta 2008-2012. ....	63
Table 6.14.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Malta .....	64
Table 6.14.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Malta.....	64
Table 6.15.1 Date of uploads for The Netherlands.....	65
Table 6.15.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for The Netherlands 2008-2012.....	66
Table 6.15.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for The Netherlands 2008-2012 .....	66
Table 6.15.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by The Netherlands .....	67
Table 6.15.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Netherlands .....	67
Table 6.16.1 Date of uploads for Poland .....	68
Table 6.16.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Poland 2008-2011 .....	69
Table 6.16.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Poland 2008-2012.....	69
Table 6.16.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Poland.....	70
Table 6.16.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Poland .....	70
Table 6.17.1 Date of uploads for Portugal .....	71
Table 6.17.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Portugal 2003-2012.....	72
Table 6.17.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Portugal 2008-2012 .....	72
Table 6.17.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Portugal .....	73
Table 6.17.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Portugal .....	73
Table 6.18.1 Date of uploads for Romania .....	74
Table 6.18.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Romania: 2008-2012 .....	75
Table 6.18.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Romania 2008-2012.....	75
Table 6.18.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Romania.....	76
Table 6.18.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Romania.....	76
Table 6.19.1 Date of uploads for Slovenia .....	77
Table 6.19.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Slovenia 2008-2012.....	78
Table 6.19.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Slovenia 2008-2012. ....	78
Table 6.19.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Slovenia .....	79
Table 6.19.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Slovenia.....	79
Table 6.20.1 Date of uploads for Spain.....	80
Table 6.20.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Spain 2008-2012.....	80
Table 6.20.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Spain 2008-2010. ....	81
Table 6.20.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Spain .....	81
Table 6.20.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Spain .....	82
Table 6.20.1 Date of uploads for Sweden.....	83
Table 6.21.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Sweden 2008-2011.....	84
Table 6.21.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Sweden 2008-2012. ....	85
Table 6.21.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Sweden .....	85
Table 6.21.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Sweden .....	86
Table 6.22.1 Date of uploads for the UK.....	87
Table 6.22.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for the UK 2008-2012.....	88
Table 6.22.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for the UK 2008-2012 .....	89

Table 6.22.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by the UK .....	89
Table 6.22.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by the UK .....	90

## 1. SUMMARY

This Data Collection Framework (DCF) coverage report was prepared by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) as part of an Administrative Arrangement with DG MARE. The purpose of the document is to provide an overview of the timeliness and completeness of the Member States data submissions to JRC in response to the call for fleet economic scientific data concerning 2008-2012 issued by DG MARE under the DCF (Council Regulation No 199/2008). Additionally, the report provides some indication of data quality, summarising major quality issues detected by JRC and the two Expert Working Groups convened under the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF). The report is part of the end user feedback provided to DG MARE to facilitate the evaluation of EU Member State compliance with obligations under the DCF.

The 2012 call for economic data on the EU fishing fleet for EU Member States was the third fleet economic data call to be requested under the EU fisheries Data Collection Framework (DCF). Reporting requirements for Member States decreased from last year's call as only data pertaining to DCF years (from 2008 onwards) were requested.

JRC enhanced existing uploading procedures to improve the transmission of the data from Member States, and carried out a number of coverage and quality checking procedures on the data submitted before, during and after the STECF EWG 12-03 meeting to check the data and produce the first draft of the 2012 Annual Economic Report on the Economic Performance of the EU fishing fleet. During EWG 12-03, national experts were requested to report on these data quality checks. Data validity reports were produced for most Member States' data submissions (see Appendix A).

The present document reports on the coverage and quality of the data submitted by the Member States during the 2012 call on fleet economic data,

The main findings of this report are:

A) In terms of compliance with the data call deadline, similar to the 2011 data call, most Member States attempted to do so. However, the quality and coverage of many datasets required improvement once inspected by JRC and national experts. The majority of uploading activity again took place after the data call deadline which impacted on STECF EWG 12-03 and again on STECF EWG 12-05.

B) Uploads of corrected or missing data after the deadline and in particular during and after the two EWGs, significantly hindered JRC's ability to produce the 2012 AER in a timely manner.

C) In terms of the completeness of the Member States data submissions, most countries submitted the majority of parameters requested under the call. Overall, coverage increased in comparison to the results of the 2011 data call. In many cases missing data relates to fleet segments with low vessel numbers for which data is hard to obtain or for which there are confidentiality issues. However, Greece and, to a lesser extent, Spain have again not submitted significant amounts of data which makes an evaluation of the overall economic performance of the EU fishing fleet in 2010-2011 not possible. In addition there are question marks as to whether some countries have submitted data on the entirety of their national fleets.

D) In terms of data quality, inevitably some 'abnormal' estimates for various parameters were detected by JRC or the experts and rectified by the Member States. In addition, the clustering of

fleet segments to report economic data have in many cases resulted in poorer quality data or unclear data submissions for some Member States. A number of quality issues remain outstanding and JRC will continue to work on reducing these errors whilst preparing this year's AER on the EU fishing fleet.



## 2. INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to evaluate Member States submissions relating to the 2012 call for economic data on the EU Member States fishing fleets. The data collected was used by the JRC and STECF to produce the 2012 Annual Economic report (AER) on the EU fishing fleet.

The data was requested under the data collection framework (DCF), cf. Council regulation (European Commission (EC) No 199/2008 of 25th February 2008). The data call requested economic and transversal data for the years 2008-2012.

For the evaluation, three main aspects relating to the Member States data submissions were considered: 1) the timeliness of the submissions (did MS comply with the deadline), 2) the completeness (coverage) of the data submitted (were all the requested parameters provided and for all years), and 3) data quality and precision (did the submitted data equate with other data sources, were the values submitted 'rational', what methods were used in the data collection process, etc.).

The 2012 call for economic data was the third call issued by the Commission that requested Member States data based on the DCF. JRC enhanced existing uploading procedures to improve the transmission of the data from Member States, and carried out a number of coverage and quality checking procedures during and after data uploads activity.

Following STECF recommendations in 2011, two EWG meetings were convened for this year's data call to produce the 2012 AER. The first meeting, EWG 12-03, was held between the 26 and 30 March 2012 and the second meeting EWG 12-05 between 4 and 8 June 2012, both in Ispra, Italy. The main objective of the first AER meeting was to produce a draft of the 2012 AER with particular emphases given to ensuring that data quality and coverage were adequate. For this effect, the data collected under the DCF for the 2012 data call was error and quality checked by JRC prior to the EWG 12-03 meeting. JRC produced draft national chapters containing data tables, graphs and basic text for the EWG 12-03. Additionally, JRC provided an excel datasheet for each member state containing all the data issues encountered in the coverage and quality checks. Experts were requested to report on each of the data issues, correct when possible, comment or flag up for further analysis. From this exercise, a country data validity report was produced for most Member States' data submissions. These reports relate to the status of the data as at 24 March 2012 and can be found in Appendix A. Subsequent changes were made to many of the MS datasets and hence these reports may not necessarily portray the current status of the data.

Section three of this report presents the contents of the data call that was issued to the Member States. Section four contains information relating to procedures undertaken by the JRC to evaluate the quality and coverage of the data submitted. Section five contains an overall evaluation of Member States compliance with the data call, and section six looks at the timeliness, quality and coverage of each Member States data submissions.

### 3. ECONOMIC DATA CALL CONTENTS

The introduction of the DCF legislation and subsequent collection of new variables meant that a greater number of 'economic' parameters were requested from 2008 onwards in comparison to previous years. However, as this year's data call requested only DCF years (2008 onwards), the amount of information requested in fact decreased in comparison to the previous year's data call.

Table 3.1 outlines all the DCF economic and transversal variables, along with their corresponding aggregation levels and years requested. No significant changes were made to the data call compared to the previous year apart from the fact that DCR data was not requested.

Some minor changes were as follows:

#### Clustering and Confidentiality

JRC produced technical guidelines for the approach to clustering fleet segments and related confidentiality issues, based on DCF guidelines, SGECA 09-02 and STECF 11-19 recommendations. These guidelines can be found on the data collection website.

<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>

#### Years requested

All DCF years (2008-2012) were requested for this data call for all Member States.

Capacity data was requested up to and including 2012, while economic parameters were requested up to and including 2010. Most effort and all landings data were requested up to and including 2011, to allow for economic performance forecasts to be estimated at fleet segment and national level for 2011, and presented in the 2012 Annual Economic Report.

All the various definitions for variables, aggregation levels, sampling strategies and accuracy indicators can be found by navigating through the data collection website.

<https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home>

Upload templates were made available for download from the sample folder on the data collection website. Experts were advised that worksheet templates should not be altered before the uploading procedure.

The data call was issued by DG MARE on the 9 February 2012, with a one month deadline. The data uploading facility on the data collection website was made available from the 9 February 2012.

Table 3.1 Requirements for 2012 DCF Fleet Economic data call.

Data Type	Variable group	Variable's Acronym	Years	Aggregation level	Other requested fields
Economic	Fishing Enterprises	OneVes	2008 - 2011	Yearly by: 1. Fleet segment 2. National totals	Sampling Strategy, Achieved Sample Rate, Coefficient of Variation (CV)
		TwoFiveVes			
		SixMoreVes			
	Employment	totjob	2008 - 2010	Yearly by: 1. Fleet segment, Supra Region 2. National totals	
		totNatFTE			
		totHarmFTE			
	Income	totLandgInc	2008 - 2011		
		totRightsInc	2008 - 2010		
		totDirSub			
		totOtherInc			
	Expenditure (Costs)	totCrewWage	2008 - 2010		
		totUnpaidLab			
		totEnerCost			
		totRepCost			
		totVarCost			
		totNoVarCost			
		totRightsCost			
		totDepCost			
	Capital & Investment	totDepHist	2008 - 2010		
		totDepRep			
		totRights			
		totInvest			
		FinPos			
Transversal	Capacity	totVes	2008 - 2012		
		avgLOA			
		totGT			
		totKw			
		avgAge			
	Effort	totSeaDays	2008 - 2011	Yearly by: 1. Fleet segment by FAO Area level 4 (Baltic), FAO Area level 3 (all other regions) 2. National totals	
		totFishDays			
		totKwFishDays			
		totGTFishDays			
		totFishOpr	2008 - 2011	Yearly by: 1. Fleet segment 2. Supra Region 3. National totals	
		totTraps			
		totNets			
		IngNets			
		totHooks			
		totSoakTime			
		totTrips			
	totEnerCons	2008 - 2010			
	Landings	totWghtLandg	2008 - 2011	Yearly by: 1. Fleet segment, FAO Area level 4 (Baltic), FAO Area level 3 (all other regions) 2. National totals	
		totValLandg			
Recreational Catches	Catches	totWghtCatch	2008 - 2011	Yearly, Region level 2 (see Appendix II)	

## 4. QUALITY AND COVERAGE CHECKING PROCEDURES

Although the quality and coverage of the data reported under the DCF are the responsibility of the Member States, JRC undertakes quality and coverage checking procedures on the data submitted. For the 2012 economic data call, the JRC introduced some new quality and coverage checking procedures, some carried out during the uploading procedure and some afterwards. This section describes these procedures in more detail.

### 4.1 Checks carried out during the uploading procedure (Syntactic checks)

During the data uploading procedure a number of automatic syntactic checks are carried out on the data before it is accepted. Member States are required to use specific Excel templates when uploading the data. These templates can be accessed on the following link: <https://datacollection.jrc.ec.europa.eu/library>

These syntactic checks are carried out without any specific knowledge of what the data contains or its meaning. They tell us if the data is present or not and in the correct format. These checks automatically reject data that do not confirm to specific restrictions, such as ensuring textual data is validated against defined parameters lists e.g. Species types, FAO code, fishing technique, vessel length, country code etc. In addition, numeric data are checked to make sure they contain numbers and not strings. In the event of errors, a message is sent to the person uploading the data. If there are more than 3 errors found in one dataset then the upload is rejected.

Member States receive immediate feedback when attempting to upload their data submissions. This helps Member States identify inconsistencies with their own data and to fix them without intervention from the data collection team. Intervention by the JRC data collection team was generally only required on technical issues with the upload server, and more complex issues regarding the datasets.

These basic Syntactic quality checks and immediate feedback have contributed significantly to the overall improvement of the quality of the data submitted.

### 4.2 Checks carried out after the uploading procedure

Once the datasets were successfully uploaded by the Member States, JRC evaluated how well the data complies with the terms of the data call by checking the coverage and quality of the data. These checks are as follows:

#### 4.2.1 National fleet capacity data checks

For the 2012 data call, capacity data (number of vessels, Gross Tonnage and kilowatts) were requested for every fleet segment (whether active or inactive) and at national level. The capacity data for the years 2008 to 2010 were compared with equivalent data contained in the EU fleet vessel register and Eurostat. The reference date is the 1 January, the same as the reference date requested under the DCF. A summary of the results of these checks can be found in section 5 and a more detailed account by Member State in section 6.

#### 4.2.2 Landings data checks

The volume and value of landings of each fish species for each year specified in the data call is requested at national level and fleet segment/FAO sub-region level. To check this data is accurate, the total volume and value of landings of all species for each Member State is compared to the total volume and value of landings reported on the EUROSTAT website for each Member State. A summary of the results of these checks can be found in section 5 and a more detailed account by Member State in section 6.

#### 4.2.3 Coverage checks

For each country, checks are carried out to ensure that all the necessary data for each fleet segment have been submitted. For active vessels, data is required on capacity, capital value, employment, effort, landings, income, expenditure and enterprises. For inactive vessels, data is required on capacity and capital value only. Reports are produced for each country that show whether a particular variable has been submitted or not. The JRC contacts the relevant Member States to query these results if required.

#### 4.2.4 Quality checks (semantic checks)

JRC carries out various checks to ensure the data being uploaded conforms to rational limits and boundaries. Most of these checks are performed manually, although some are fully or partially automated. These checks flag up 'suspicious' data whose values warrant further investigation. All data that is flagged in this way are highlighted to the Member States who submitted the data (see also Appendix 1A for Country data validity reports). These checks are detailed below:

##### Capacity checks

- Number of vessels, kW, GT > 0
- kW / GT > 1 (for each fleet segment)
- Mean age > 0, < 80
- Average length should be within the length boundaries of the fleet segment
- Number of vessels < = total employed (unless inactive)
- Number of vessels > = number of fishing enterprises
- Number of vessels < 30000 (at national level)

##### Employment checks

- Full Time Equivalent (FTE) harmonised < = Engaged crew
- FTE national < = Engaged crew

##### Landings / Income checks

- Value of landings > = 70% of the sum of value of landings, income from fishing rights, subsidies and non-fishing income
- Total value of landings for each species collected under 'Landings' should equal value of landings collected under 'Income'
- Assess the percentage of each Income item (income from landings, income from fishing rights, direct subsidies, and other income) with the sum of all the income items.

##### Expenditure / profits

- Sum of all income items (income from landings, income from fishing rights, direct subsidies, other income) - sum of all expenditure items (Crew wages, unpaid labour, energy costs, repair costs, variable costs, fixed costs, rights costs, depreciation costs). This gives a rough measure of 'profit'. Then report the 'profit' as a % of the sum of all the income items.
- Calculate each expenditure item (Crew wages, unpaid labour, energy costs, repair costs, variable costs, fixed costs, rights costs, depreciation costs) as a % of the sum of income (income from landings, income from fishing rights, direct subsidies, other income).

##### Effort data checks

- Days at Sea > = Fishing days
- Days at Sea / Number of vessels < 365 days
- Fishing days / Number of vessels < 365 days
- Number of trips / Number of vessels < 365 trips
- Number of days at sea / number of trips = Number of days per trip < 20

## 5. OVERALL EVALUATION

### 5.1 Data Submission and Coverage

The 2012 call on EU Fleet Economic data was officially launched by DG MARE on the 9 February 2012. Timely submission of data with respect to the data call deadline is necessary given the timescales for the production of the AER. JRC sent an early warning to all Member States in early January 2012. Member States were given one month in which to submit data from the issue of the call, making a deadline of the 9 March 2012. There were around 10 working days between the deadline of the data call and the EWG 12-03 meeting to produce the first draft of the 2012 AER.

Figure 5.1 shows the uploading activity by each Member State with respect to the data call deadline and the two AER meetings (EWG 12-03 and EWG 12-05). Where issues were found with the data, the Member States were asked to look again at their data, re-submitting where necessary. Not all potential errors that were detected were addressed by the Member States. Some MS did not respond, others provided reasons why the data was incorrect, while some corrected their data and resubmitted.

During the EWG 12-03 meeting itself, most national experts found issues with the data that required rectifying. This led to further uploading activity during EWG 12-03 (26-30 March 2012). Some of the errors identified required time to correct and therefore some countries changed and re-uploaded their data submissions after the AER meeting. Similarly, during EWG 12-05, further issues with the data were found, in particular for France and Portugal, which required rectifying, leading to additional uploading activity. The most recent uploading activity was carried out by Malta, who uploaded new effort and capacity data on the 12 June 2012, almost a week after the second AER meeting (EWG 12-05, 4-8 June 2012).

In total, over 320,000 data values of all parameter types for all DCF years (2008-2012) were submitted to JRC from all Member States, over a three and a half month period. A total of 1081 data upload attempts (including unsuccessful attempts) were carried out by the Member States, with the majority occurring before the deadline (58%). A further 275 upload attempts (25%) were carried out up to and during the EWG 12-03 and 174 attempts (16%) leading to, during and after the EWG 12-05.

Figures 5.2 and 5.3 show the status of the uploading activity by each Member State by variable group as at the data call deadline (9 March 2012) and the current situation (1 July 2012), almost 4 months after the data call deadline.

Greece did not provide any data. A statement was sent to the JCR data collection team stating that Greece would not be submitting any data in this year's data call on the 21 March 2012; almost 3 weeks after the deadline (see Appendix B). Spain did not provide any capacity, capital investment and landings FAO (by species) data for any of the years requested. Belgium, Denmark, Spain, the UK, and Portugal did not submit any data on recreational catches. Romania again did not provide any data on capital values for all DCF years. Denmark, Estonia, Malta, Portugal and Slovenia did not provide information on fleet segment clustering.

Yet, despite these shortfalls, there has been an overall improvement in terms of coverage compared to the 2011 data call (notwithstanding that only DCF years were requested). National level economic performance indicators for all years (apart for Slovenia for 2008 and 2009) and forecasts figures for 2011 were estimated for all Member States (excluding Greece). However, it was not possible to estimate all economic performance indicators for all fleets segments, in part due to clustering but also, in many cases, due to insufficient/missing relevant data.

The DCF capacity (number of vessels, GT and kW) and landings (value and weight) data submitted by the Member States were compared against Eurostat values for the years 2008-2010 (Eurostat statistical data for 2011 were not yet available at the time of writing this report) in order to evaluate the overall coverage of the submitted data. A table containing these figures, as well as the percentage difference between DCF data for the number of vessels, gross tonnage (GT) and kilowatts (kW) reported by each MS for the years requested in the data call and the corresponding Eurostat values, is provided for each MS in section 6.

Similar to last year, the differences between the number of vessels reported under the data call and the Eurostat statistics are in many cases significant and suggest there is reason to investigate these discrepancies further. In particular, results for Bulgaria, Cyprus, France and The Netherlands reveal significant differences in vessel numbers in one or more years. In terms of tonnage, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Latvia and Malta have significant differences in one or more years. In terms of kilowatts, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Latvia, Malta, The Netherlands and Romania reveal significant differences in one or more years. (For the purpose of these analyses we defined 'significant difference' as greater than 10%).

The percentage difference between the total value of landings reported by each MS in the data call and the corresponding total value of landings reported by each MS in Eurostat statistics was found to be significant in many of the cases. The values submitted by Italy, Malta, Poland, and to a lesser extent, Romania and Sweden, match well with the values related to Eurostat. Due to missing data, figures for Spain and The Netherlands could not be evaluated.

Significant discrepancies were also observed between the total volume of landings reported by each MS for the years requested in the data call and the corresponding total volume of landings reported by each country in Eurostat statistics. In particular, the landings volumes for Germany, Denmark and The Netherlands appear to be significantly under-reported in the DCF submitted data. In the remaining cases, the figures either matched well between the two data sources or appear to be over-reported in the DCF data submitted during the data call. Again, figures for Spain could not be evaluated due to missing data (see section 6, results reported by Member State).

Table 5.1 highlights the main outstanding issues for each Member State, as at 1 July 2012. It states which datasets or specific variables were not submitted and where major quality issues remain. While some (relatively small) issues remain for most Member States, the Member States who have not submitted significant amounts of the data requested are as follows:

*Greece:* No data uploaded by Greece for any of the requested years. JRC contacted Greece, who answered that for reasons internal to their organisation, no data would be uploaded for this year's data call.

*Spain:* Spain's data submission, as in previous years, continues to be very incomplete. For all years, no data on the value of landings by species has been submitted. JRC contacted the Spanish national correspondent on several occasions but received no response.

## 5.2 Quality and Precision

As part of their reporting requirements, Member States are required to state an accuracy indicator for each data value submitted in the data call. In this year's data call, instead of precision level which was requested last year, the coefficient of variation was requested (as recommended by STECF 11-19).

Information on the sampling strategies, sample sizes and accuracy indicators used to produce the estimates submitted for all years was requested. As part of their reporting requirements, Member

States are required to state an accuracy indicator for each data value submitted in the data call. In this year's data call, instead of precision level which was requested last year, the coefficient of variation was requested (as recommended by STECF 11-19). These values are not reported here due to several inconsistencies found in the submitted values, for example, some MS provided precision level instead of the coefficient of variation.

Table 5.2 summarises which sampling categories each Member states data values fell into. The vast majority of data submitted were collected through census (between 82-93% depending on the year). Probability sample surveys were used more often than non-probability sample surveys for parameters such as costs, capital values and investments, employment etc. (see section 6, results by Member State). A full description by Member State and fleet segment can be provided upon request.





Figure 5.2 Fleet Economic data call coverage overview by Member State: At deadline(9 March 2012)

Excel Sheet Name	BEL	BGR	CYP	DEU	DNK	ESP	EST	FIN	FRA	GBR	GRC	IRL	ITA	LTU	LVA	MLT	NLD	POL	PRT	ROU	SVN	SWE
CAPACITY	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
CAPACITY_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
CAPVALINVEST	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	Red	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green	Red	Green
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
EFFORT_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
EMPLOYMENT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
EXPENDITURE	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
EXPENDITURE_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
FISHENT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
FISHENT_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
INCOME	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
INCOME_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green
REC_CATCH	Red	Green	Red	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green

\* Green squares indicate at least partial data submitted under parameter grouping, red indicates no data submitted.

Figure 5.3 Fleet Economic data call coverage overview by Member State: Current situation (1 July 2012)

Excel Sheet Name	BEL	BGR	CYP	DEU	DNK	ESP	EST	FIN	FRA	GBR	GRC	IRL	ITA	LTU	LVA	MLT	NLD	POL	PRT	ROU	SVN	SWE
CAPACITY																						
CAPACITY_TOT																						
CAPVALINVEST																						
CAPVALINVEST_TOT																						
CLUSTER_DEFINITION																						
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4																						
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA																						
EFFORT_TOT																						
EMPLOYMENT																						
EMPLOYMENT_TOT																						
EXPENDITURE																						
EXPENDITURE_TOT																						
FISHENT																						
FISHENT_TOT																						
INCOME																						
INCOME_TOT																						
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4																						
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT																						
REC_CATCH																						

\* Green squares indicate at least partial data submitted under parameter grouping, red indicates no data submitted.

Table 5.1 Summary of missing data/outstanding issues

Country	DCF (2008-2011)
Belgium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Recreational catch data not submitted</li> </ul>
Bulgaria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Recreational catch data missing(blank template)</li> <li>•National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly lower than at fleet segment level</li> <li>•Landings value data lower than Eurostat statistics, particularly for 2009</li> <li>•Insufficient clustering information</li> </ul>
Cyprus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Landings(value and weight for total and fleet segment level)and effort data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not submitted</li> <li>•Fleet segment level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) lower than at the national level</li> <li>•Average age of vessels not submitted for all years at national level</li> </ul>
Denmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Reported landings weight and value significantly lower than Eurostat data</li> <li>•Capacity data for 2012 not provided; missing national level capacity data for 2011</li> <li>•Fishing enterprise data for 2011 not submitted</li> <li>•Only partial effort data submitted for all years</li> <li>•Landings income for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Fleet segment clustering information not provided</li> <li>•Recreational catch data not submitted</li> </ul>
Estonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Only partial effort data reported for all years</li> <li>•Fleet segment clustering information not submitted</li> <li>•Landings value data lower than Eurostat statistics</li> </ul>
Finland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not provided</li> </ul>
France	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Landings and effort data for 2011 (total and fleet segment level) not provided</li> <li>•Missing effort data for several of the requested years; no sea days, fishing days data, energy consumption for 2009 at national and fleet segment levels</li> <li>•Capacity data for 2011 and 2012 not provided</li> <li>•Reported capacity data lower than Eurostat statistics</li> <li>•Landings income data and fishing enterprise data for 2011 not submitted</li> <li>•Financial position data for all requested years and depreciation replacement value for 2009, at national and fleet segment levels not provided</li> <li>•Unpaid labour values not submitted for any years</li> </ul>
Germany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Not a real national picture, –around half (or more than half according to Eurostat statistics) total weight of landings are not reported due to confidentiality issues (pelagic fleet)</li> </ul>
Greece	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•No data submitted for any of the requested years</li> </ul>
Ireland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Landings value data significantly lower than Eurostat data</li> <li>•Landings and effort data for 2011 (national and fleet segment levels) not provided</li> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Only partial (energy consumption and fishing trips) effort data submitted</li> </ul>
Italy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Landings and effort data (for total and fleet segment levels) for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Capacity data for 2012 not submitted</li> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Financial position value for national fleet for 2010 and investment data for any of the years requested not submitted</li> </ul>
Latvia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Vessel tonnage and kilowatts data significantly lower than Eurostat statistics</li> <li>•Investment values and depreciation cost for 2008 not provided</li> </ul>

Lithuania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Capacity data for 2012 not provided</li> <li>•Landings data significantly higher than Eurostat statistics</li> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not submitted</li> <li>•Financial position and investment values for 2008 at national level</li> <li>•Energy consumption values for 2008 not provided</li> </ul>
Malta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fleet tonnage data significantly lower than Eurostat statistics</li> <li>•Only partial effort data submitted;</li> </ul>
Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Capacity data lower than Eurostat statistics</li> <li>•Available landings value data significantly lower than Eurostat figures</li> <li>•Financial position value for 2010 at national level not provided</li> </ul>
Poland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not submitted</li> <li>•Landings weight data significantly higher than figures reported in Eurostat</li> </ul>
Portugal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Recreational catch data not submitted</li> <li>•Financial position values not submitted</li> <li>•Only partial effort data for 2011</li> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Unpaid labour costs not submitted for 2008 and 2009</li> <li>•Fleet segment clustering information not submitted</li> <li>•Landings value data significantly higher than figures reported in Eurostat</li> </ul>
Romania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Capital values and investments data not submitted</li> <li>•Capacity data (GT) higher than Eurostat statistics for 2008-2009, but lower for 2010</li> </ul>
Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Volume and value of landings at FAO area level and national totals not submitted for any of the years requested</li> <li>•Capacity and capital values not submitted for all years</li> <li>•Effort data for 2011 not submitted; only partial effort data (energy consumption) for all years</li> <li>•Landings income and fishing enterprise data for 2011 not provided</li> <li>•Recreational catch data not submitted</li> </ul>
Slovenia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Effort data submitted only for 2010</li> <li>•Expenditure data for 2008 and 2009 not provided</li> <li>•Economic performance indicators not estimated for 2008 and 2009 due to insufficient data</li> <li>•Fleet segment clustering information not submitted</li> <li>•Reported landings value data higher than Eurostat statistics</li> </ul>
Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fleet segment level capacity data for 2012 not submitted</li> <li>•Landings income data for 2011 not provided</li> </ul>
United Kingdom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Recreational catch data not submitted</li> <li>•Energy costs for 2010 not submitted for national and fleet segment levels; only partial effort data submitted (fishing trips)</li> <li>•National level capacity data (number of vessels, GT, kW) significantly less than fleet level data in 2009-2012</li> <li>•Reported landings weight higher than Eurostat statistics</li> </ul>

Table 5.2 Summary of Member States sampling strategies in 2008-2012

Member State	2008					2008 Total	2009				2009 Total	2010				2010 Total	2011			2011 Total	2012		2012 Total
	n/a	Census	Non-probab	Probab	Combinati		n/a	Census	Non-probab	Probab		n/a	Census	Non-probab	n/a		n/a	Census	Probability sample survey		n/a	Census	
			lity sample survey	lity sample survey					lity sample survey	lity sample survey				lity sample survey									
BEL	139	2512	57	12		2720	137	2677	75		2889	139	2552	77		2768	120	2434		2554	5	60	65
BGR	54	327				381	54	331			385	54	329			383	34	293		327	8	28	36
CYP	139	290		145		574	151	395	16	74	636	153	403	4	109	669	13	48		61	10	55	65
DEU	214	2760	56	43	3	3076	193	2838		89	3120	190	2677		99	2966	164	2202	8	2374	5	155	160
DNK	142	4676	323			5141	142	4417	323		4882	142	4511	304		4957	117	4348		4465			
ESP	17	90		644		751	17	101		728	846	19	105		816	940							
EST	75	314		32		421	75	312		32	419	77	334		32	443	57	279		336	5	30	35
FIN	82	312	98			492	82	340	92		514	82	354	92		528	62	311		373	5	2	7
FRA	1860	8758				10618	2758	42344			45102	2027	16580			18607							
GBR	392	16125	563	42		17122	390	16489	563	40	17482	383	16121	563		17067	355	16103		16458	5	255	260
IRL	283	6624	387			7294	294	5101	428		5823	313	5257	415		5985	8	238		246	5	195	200
ITA	298	346	13	3702		4359	265	366	13	3960	4604	259	315	6	3970	4550	5	140		145			
LTU	191	572				763	132	472			604	158	532			690	131	445		576			
LVA	49	253				302	51	242			293	51	223			274	31	147		178	5	20	25
MLT	233	1141		680		2054	229	1208		828	2265	284	1296		598	2178	256	1309	277	1842	5	145	150
NLD	232	1984		111		2327	214	1971		108	2293	279	2427		108	2814	304	2215		2519	5	85	90
POL	125	484		98		707	126	525		104	755	161	572		99	832	119	450		569	5		5
PRT	788	11403		437		12628	788	11010		462	12260	746	11107		585	12438	735	10119		10854	5	256	261
ROU	61	161		108		330	79	201		122	402	75	176		98	349	81	199	137	417	5	55	60
SVN	208	1012				1220	200	944			1144	216	1294			1510	192	931		1123	5	80	85
SWE	183	2886		122		3191	173	2943		123	3239	197	2832		123	3152	167	2704		2871	5		5
	5765	63030	1497	6176	3	76471	6550	95227	1510	6670	109957	6005	69997	1461	6637	84100	2951	44915	422	48288	88	1421	1509

## 6. COUNTRY BY COUNTRY EVALUATION

In this section, a more in-depth analysis of the data coverage and quality issues relating to each Member State is provided. The tables presented are self-explanatory and hence, an exhaustive description of each has not been provided. Additionally, missing variables by fleet segment have not been reported mainly due to issues related to clustering, which in many cases have made it difficult to ascertain with certainty outstanding variables.

### 6.1 BELGIUM

#### 6.1.1 Delivery of data

Most of the requested datasets were uploaded around one week before the data call deadline. Cluster definitions were submitted almost 3 weeks after the deadline, during the first AER meeting. The landings datasets (at national and fleet segment levels) were re-uploaded more than two months after the deadline. Requested data on Recreational catches were not submitted (Table 6.1.1).

Table 6.1.1 Date of uploads for Belgium

BEL Templates	3/1/2012	3/27/2012	5/30/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1			1
CAPACITY_TOT	1			1
CAPVALINVEST	1			1
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1			1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION		1		1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1			1
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	1			1
EFFORT_TOT	1			1
EMPLOYMENT	1			1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1			1
EXPENDITURE	1			1
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1			1
FISHENT	1			1
FISHENT_TOT	1			1
INCOME	1			1
INCOME_TOT	1			1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1		1	2
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1		1	2
REC_CATCH				

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

#### 6.1.2 Coverage

Table 6.1.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Belgium. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When

evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.1.2 we check that all the requested parameters are present or absent. However, it is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information. In the Belgium data submission, several fleet segments were clustered and identified although some issues on the clustering approach used remain.

Table 6.1.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Belgium 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	4	4	5	6	4
VL1012		1	1		
VL1218	3	2	2	4	3
VL1824	1	1	2	2	1
DRB	1	2	2	2	1
VL1824	1	1	1	1	1
VL2440		1	1	1	
DTS	6	7	6	9	9
VL1012	1			1	1
VL1218					2
VL1824	1	2	2	4	2
VL2440	4	5	4	4	4
INACTIVE	4	8	5	6	4
VL1218		1	1		
VL1824	2	2	1	1	1
VL2440	2	5	3	5	3
TBB	87	79	71	66	68
VL1218	5	5	5	5	3
VL1824	35	34	34	32	34
VL2440	47	40	32	29	31
Total	102	100	89	89	86

The data in Tables 6.2.2 and 6.2.3, suggest that most or all capacity data (number of vessels, kW and GT) at the national and fleet segment levels were reported for all years. Number of vessels reported equates to Eurostat data and fleet segment totals equate to National totals for most years. Landings parameters equate roughly to Eurostat values, although slightly higher for DCF data.



Table 6.1.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Belgium 2008-2012

BEL	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	102	100	102%	100	89	112%	89	89	100%	89	86
TOT	102		102%	100		112%	89		100%	89	86
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	19292	19007	101%	19007	16048	118%	16048	15812	101%	15812	15326
TOT	19292		101%	19007		118%	16048		101%	15812	15326
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	60620	60620	100%	60620	51590	118%	51590	51236	101%	51198	49135
TOT	60620		100%	60620		118%	51590		101%	51198	49135
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	76263	62044	123%	67961	56253	121%	76150	61206	124%	79437	
TOT	76263		123%	67961		121%	76242		125%	79437	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	20007	17349	115%	18989	16016	119%	19738	16129	122%	20138	
TOT	20007		115%	18989		119%	19767		123%	20138	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

### 6.1.3 Quality

The following table summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Belgium in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.1.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Belgium

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
BEL	139	2512	57	12	137	2677	75		139	2552	77		120	2434		5	60
Capacity	5	55			4	52			4	52			4	48		4	48
Capital	3			9	3	21			3	21							
Effort	7	156	3	3	7	185	5		7	191	7		5	178			
Employment	3	27			3	30			3	30							
Enterprises	3	10			3	12			3	15			3	11			
Expenditure	8		48		8		56		8		56						
Income	4	18	6		4	14	14		4	14	14		1	7			
Landings	106	2246			104	2350			106	2216			106	2178			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.1.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Belgium

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>BEL</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital				55		77.8				69.2							
Effort	75	100	55	55	75.0	99.2	60.6		89.0	99.1	89.3		100	100			
Employment		100				100				100							
Enterprises		100				100				100				100			
Expenditure			44.2				93.1				90.1						
Income			55				93.1				86.4						
Landings	100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- Clustering of fleet segments not always consistent over the time series and variables, making interpretation of the data sometimes difficult.

## 6.2 BULGARIA

### 6.2.1 Delivery of data

All of the requested datasets were uploaded before the data call deadline. Following JRC coverage and quality checks, a number of datasets were amended after the AER meeting EWG 12-03, see table 6.2.1.

Table 6.2.1 Date of uploads for Bulgaria

BGR Templates	3/7/2012	4/6/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	2	3	5
CAPACITY_TOT	1	1	2
CAPVALINVEST	1	1	2
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1	1	2
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	1		1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	12	1	13
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	18	1	19
EFFORT_TOT	2	1	3
EMPLOYMENT	1		1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1		1
EXPENDITURE	1		1
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1		1
FISHENT	1		1
FISHENT_TOT	1		1
INCOME	6	2	8
INCOME_TOT	3	2	5
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1		1
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1		1
REC_CATCH	1		1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.2.2 Coverage

Table 6.2.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Bulgaria. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.2.2 we check that all the requested parameters are present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information. In the case of Bulgaria's data submission, insufficient clustering information was provided making it difficult to evaluate coverage at the fleet segment level.

Table 6.2.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Bulgaria 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	486	724	843	44	342
VL0006	182	262	323	38	342
VL0612	281	426	478	4	
VL1218	23	25	31	1	
VL1824		11	11	1	
FPO	39	36	49	69	
VL0612	39	36	49	69	
HOK	57	65	83	15	
VL0006	20	18	30	1	
VL0612	37	47	53	14	
INACTIVE	1826	1303	1309	1335	
VL0040	1826	1303	1309	1335	
PMP	233	242	350	843	656
VL0006	38	41	79	302	
VL0612	150	143	164	498	585
VL1218	34	45	94	36	59
VL1824	11	13	13	6	12
VL2440				1	
TM	39	51	58	39	12
VL1218	18	26	31	23	
VL1824	10	13	14	5	
VL2440	11	12	13	11	12
Total	2680	2421	2692	2345	1010

Table 6.2.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Bulgaria 2008-2012.

BGR	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	2680	2852	94%	2421	2206	110%	2692	2340	115%	2345	1010
TOT	854		30%	1118		51%	1383		59%	1010	1010
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	9397	9047	104%	10891	7772	140%	10197	8014	127%	7511.27	4966.33
TOT	5385		60%	7973		103%	7481		93%	4966.33	4965
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	71872	70512	102%	81458	60319	135%	77744	63378	123%	62061	33686
TOT	31831		45%	50858		84%	48381		76%	33686	33686
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	2965	3139	94%	2688	3130	86%	2152	2297	94%	2698	
TOT	2965		94%	2688		86%	2152		94%	2698	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	7466	7652	98%	7078	7393	96%	9246	9674	96%	7600	
TOT	7466		98%	7078		96%	9246		96%	7600	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.2.2 and 6.2.3, suggest that a significant amount of capacity data (number of vessels, kW) at the national level have not been reported for all years. The number of vessels at the national level submitted for the years 2008-2010 were around 40% (between 30 and 59%) less than the corresponding number of vessels reported in Eurostat statistics. Conversely, the number of vessels, GT and kW at the fleet segment level also do not match well with Eurostat statistics, but in these cases were higher than Eurostat values. In addition, when comparing the number of vessels at fleet segment level with the number reported for national totals, significant differences were encountered, with national total significantly lower. This problem applies to all reported

years. Gross tonnage appears to be under-reported for 2008, but data for 2009 and 2010 match with that of Eurostat. Landings parameters equate roughly to Eurostat values for all years.

### 6.2.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Bulgaria in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.2.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Bulgaria

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>BGR</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>327</b>			<b>54</b>	<b>331</b>			<b>54</b>	<b>329</b>			<b>34</b>	<b>293</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>28</b>
Capacity	4	56			4	60			4	60			4	64		4	20
Capital	4	20			4	20			4	20							
Effort	12	74			12	73			12	71			10	89			
Employment	3	15			3	15			3	15							
Enterprises	3	15			3	15			3	15			3	15		3	3
Expenditure	8	40			8	40			8	40							
Income	4	20			4	20			4	20			1	18			
Landings	14	70			14	70			14	70			14	86			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.2.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Bulgaria

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>BGR</b>																	
Capacity		100				100.0				100				100			100
Capital		52.6				55.6				73.6							
Effort	100	96.8			100	97.0			100	98.1			100	100			
Employment		52.8				55.6				73.6							
Enterprises		100				100				100				100			100
Expenditure		52.8				55.6				73.6							
Income		52.8				55.6				73.6				100			
Landings	100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- Significant amount of missing data at the fleet segment level
- Discrepancies between national and fleet segment totals
- Incomplete information on approach to clustering across time series and variables; reasons for clustering unclear due to large number of vessels. Missing variables by fleet segment cannot be confirmed due to insufficient data on fleet clusters.

## 6.3 CYPRUS

### 6.3.1 Delivery of data

All data submissions were uploaded after the data call deadline. Uploading activity spanned over a two a half month period, with the last upload occurring on 1 June 2012. Following JRC coverage and quality checks, a number of datasets were amended before the AER meeting, see table 6.3.1.

Table 6.3.1 Date of uploads for Cyprus.

CYP	3/23/2012	3/26/2012	3/27/2012	3/30/2012	6/1/2012	upload attempts
Templates						
CAPACITY		1	2			3
CAPACITY_TOT			1			1
CAPVALINVEST				1	1	2
CAPVALINVEST_TOT				1	1	2
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	2					2
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4		1		1		2
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA		1		3		4
EFFORT_TOT		1		1		2
EMPLOYMENT	1					1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1					1
EXPENDITURE		2		1	1	4
EXPENDITURE_TOT		1		1	1	3
FISHENT	1					1
FISHENT_TOT	1					1
INCOME		2			3	5
INCOME_TOT		2			2	4
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	4				3	7
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	2				1	3
REC_CATCH	1					1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.3.2 Coverage

Table 6.3.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Cyprus. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.3.2 we check that all the requested parameters are present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information, which was found to be the case for Cyprus. Only two clusters were identified although it appears that at least one other fleet segment was clustered.

Table 6.3.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Cyprus 2008-2012.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DTS	9	10	11	9	7
VL1824	2	2			
VL1840			11	9	7
VL2440	7	8			
INACTIVE	832	866			
VL0006	359	365			
VL0612	462	476			
VL1218	7	19			
VL1824	3	4			
VL2440	1	2			
PG	499	492	500	500	471
VL0006	32	36	45	45	34
VL0612	467	456	455	455	437
PGO		381	382	434	357
VL0006		273	293	326	283
VL0612		108	89	108	74
PGP	22	18	20	22	23
VL1218	22	13			
VL1224			20	22	23
VL1824		1			
VL2440		4			
Total	1362	1767	913	965	858

Table 6.3.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Cyprus 2008-2012.

CYP	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	1362	1169	117%	1767	1162	152%	913	1006	91%	965	858
TOT	1618		138%	1768		152%	1132		113%	1105	858
Gross tonnage											
FFT	5100	5383	95%	6671	5289	126%	4144	4161	100%	3938.11	3466.63
TOT	6776		126%	6841		129%	4708		113%	4620.53	3466.63
kW											
FFT	52646	49023	107%	49778	48445	103%	40403	42931	94%	41676	35935
TOT	63611		130%	69000		142%	45458		106%	46147	35935
Landings value											
FFT	13200	12736	104%	9056	8577	106%	10208	10105	101%		
TOT	13200		104%	8843		103%	10211		101%		
Landings weight											
FFT	1995	1868	107%	1397	1309	107%	1379	1378.3	100%	n/a	
TOT	1982		106%	1397		107%	1379		100%	n/a	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Table 6.3.2 suggests that some capacity data, in particular at the fleet segment level, for several years were not reported. In addition, when comparing national and fleet segment totals, some discrepancies were observed for capacity data as landings data match, apart from missing data for landings value at the national level for 2009.

### 6.3.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Cyprus in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.3.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Cyprus

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>CYP</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>290</b>		<b>145</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>48</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>55</b>
Capacity	8	40			8	56			8	25			8	24		8	44
Capital	4	10		8	4	10		8	4	10		8					
Effort	12	23		28	12	22	16	38	12	41	4	43					
Employment	3	6		3	3	6		6	3	6		12					
Enterprises	3	12			3	12			3	18			3	18			
Expenditure	8	16		8	8	16		16	8	16		32					
Income	4	8		4	4	8		4	4	8		12					
Landings	94	165		88	106	250			108	272							

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.3.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Cyprus

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>CYP</b>																	
Capacity		NR				NR										NR	
Capital		75.5		12.0		75.5		12.0		63.5		36.5					
Effort		75.5		12.0		76.5		15.9		61.0	14.5	15.6	NR				
Employment		75.5				71.0		NR		63.5			NR				
Enterprises		NR														NR	
Expenditure		75.5		12.0		75.5		12.0		63.5		28.8					
Income		NR		12.0				16.0				26.0					
Landings				12.0													

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; combination survey

Other quality issues include:

- Significant amount of information not reported for many fleet segments
- Discrepancies between national and fleet segment totals
- Incomplete information on approach to clustering across time series and variables; reasons for clustering unclear due to large number of vessels. Missing variables by fleet segment cannot be confirmed due to insufficient data on fleet clusters
- Forecast figures for 2011 had to be based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call



## 6.4 DENMARK

### 6.4.1 Delivery of data

Around half of the datasets requested were uploaded on the data call deadline. The remainder were uploaded throughout the month of March, along with several re-submissions, see table 6.4.1.

Table 6.4.1 Date of uploads for Denmark

DNK Templates	3/9/2012	3/11/2012	3/13/2012	3/31/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY		3	1	1	5
CAPACITY_TOT		2	1	1	4
CAPVALINVEST	1	2		2	5
CAPVALINVEST_TOT		1		1	2
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3				1	1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4			1	1	2
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	2	3	1	2	8
EFFORT_TOT			1	2	3
EMPLOYMENT	2			2	4
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1			1	2
EXPENDITURE	1			1	2
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1			1	2
FISHENT			3	1	4
FISHENT_TOT			2	1	3
INCOME	1			3	4
INCOME_TOT	1			2	3
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1		5	1	7
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1		1	1	3
REC_CATCH					

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.4.2 Coverage

Table 6.4.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Denmark. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.4.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information. In the case of Denmark, no clustering information was provided and, hence, missing variables cannot be fully evaluated.

Table 6.4.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Denmark 2008-2011.

	2008	2009	2010	2011
DRB	63	66	54	
VL1012	30	32	24	
VL1218	33	34	30	
DTS	368	355	323	
VL0010	12	10		
VL1012	10	13	16	
VL1218	184	177	168	
VL1824	79	77	68	
VL2440	51	46	42	
VL40XX	32	32	29	
INACTIVE	1003	1017	1043	1060
VL0010	890	914	989	1003
VL1012	9	9	12	19
VL1218	57	49	25	24
VL1824	18	21	9	9
VL2440	22	23	8	3
VL40XX	7	1		2
PGP	1166	1124	1029	
VL0010	1041	1000	919	
VL1012	66	67	65	
VL1218	59	57	45	
PMP	184	197	205	
VL0010	91	105	109	
VL1012	30	31	29	
VL1218	47	46	51	
VL1824	16	15	16	
TBB	29	27	28	
VL1218	16	14	11	
VL1824	13	13	17	
Total	2813	2786	2682	1060

Table 6.4.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Denmark 2008-2010.

DNK	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	2813	2895	97%	2786	2832	98%	2682	2826	95%	1060	
TOT	2813		97%	2786		98%	2682		95%		
Gross tonnage											
FFT	78774	73040	108%	74360	67734	110%	67962	66353	102%	4288	
TOT	78774		108%	74360		110%	67962		102%		
kW											
FFT	282918	263914	107%	269231	245793	110%	247432	241962	102%	28142	
TOT	282918		107%	269231		110%	247432		102%		
Landings value											
FFT	334088	432545	77%	283699	360444	79%	378311	461737	82%	410564	
TOT	334088		77%	283699		79%	378311		82%		
Landings weight											
FFT	687098	984766	70%	757958	1054957	72%	782420	1066559	73%	703072	
TOT	687098		70%	757958		72%	782420		73%		

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.4.2 and 6.4.3, suggest that a significant amount of landings data (in value and weight) at both the national and fleet segment levels have not been reported for all years. These data correspond to around 70-80% of the figures reported by Eurostat. Conversely, national totals match fleet segment totals for all parameters analysed and for all years.

### 6.4.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Denmark in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.4.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Denmark

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>DNK</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>4676</b>	<b>323</b>		<b>142</b>	<b>4417</b>	<b>323</b>		<b>142</b>	<b>4511</b>	<b>304</b>		<b>117</b>	<b>4348</b>			
Capacity	4	92			4	92			4	84				24			
Capital	3		51		3		51		3		48						
Effort	7	498	34		7	470	34		7	458	32		5	470			
Employment	3		51		3		51		3		48						
Enterprises	3	39			3	42			3	40							
Expenditure	8		136		8		136		8		128						
Income	3		51		3		51		3		48						
Landings	110	4024			110	3790			110	3908			112	3848			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.4.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Denmark

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>DNK</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital			27.8				30.4				33.2						
Effort			27.8				30.4				33.2						
Employment			27.8				30.4				33.2						
Enterprises																	
Expenditure			27.8				30.4				33.2						
Income			27.8				30.4				33.2						
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- Cluster information not provided
- Possible incomplete landings dataset
- Missing capacity data for 2011 and 2012, effort data for all years
- Forecast figures for 2011 had to be based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call

## 6.5 ESTONIA

### 6.5.1 Delivery of data

All of Estonian data were uploaded on the data call deadline. Following JRC coverage and quality checks, all datasets were amended and re-uploaded on the 28 March 2012, during EWG 12-03, see table 6.5.1.

Table 6.5.1 Date of uploads for Estonia

EST Templates	3/9/2012	3/28/2012	upload attempt
CAPACITY	2	1	3
CAPACITY_TOT	1	1	2
CAPVALINVEST	2	1	3
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	2	1	3
CLUSTER_DEFINITION			
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1	1	2
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	1	1	2
EFFORT_TOT	1	1	2
EMPLOYMENT	2	1	3
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	2	1	3
EXPENDITURE	2	1	3
EXPENDITURE_TOT	2	1	3
FISHENT	3	1	4
FISHENT_TOT	2	1	3
INCOME	2	1	3
INCOME_TOT	2	1	3
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1	1	2
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1	1	2
REC_CATCH	1	1	2

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.5.2 Coverage

Table 6.5.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Estonia. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.5.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. For Estonia, it was not always possible to confirm outstanding variable due to outstanding information on fleet segment clustering.

Table 6.5.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Estonia 2005-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DTS	6	4	5	5	5
VL40XX	6	4	5	5	5
INACTIVE	14	22	13	11	
VL1218	9	15	8	8	
VL2440	1	3	2	2	
VL40XX	4	4	3	1	
PG	880	884	881	876	872
VL0010	790	794	791	790	786
VL1012	90	90	90	86	86
TM	64	53	48	42	46
VL1218	24	15	13	10	15
VL2440	40	38	35	32	31
Total	964	963	947	934	923

Table 6.5.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Estonia 2008-2011.

EST	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	964	966	100%	963	945	102%	947	935	101%	934	923
TOT	964		100%	963		102%	947		101%	934	932
Gross tonnage											
FFT	19795	17808	111%	17841	14238	125%	17349	14645	118%	14669	12768
TOT	19795		111%	17841		125%	17349		118%	14669	12768
kW											
FFT	50271	45974	109%	45897	39812	115%	44356	40206	110%	39601	36784
TOT	50271		109%	45897		115%	44356		110%	39601	36784
Landings value											
FFT	15597	18764	83%	14437	18222	79%	13140	17754	74%	13778	
TOT	15597		83%	14437		79%	13139		74%	13779	
Landings weight											
FFT	83550	83143	100%	83546	88843	94%	81293	87373	93%	63344	
TOT	83550		100%	83544		94%	81290		93%	63344	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.5.2 and 6.5.3, suggest an almost complete coverage of the data submitted. No significant discrepancies found between both data sources, apart from landings value for all years. These appear to be under-reported in the DCF data. National totals equate to fleet segment totals for all parameters analysed.

### 6.5.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Estonia in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.5.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Estonia

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
EST	75	314		32	75	312		32	77	334		32	57	279		5	30
Capacity	4	32			4	32			4	36			4	36		4	24
Capital	4	10		8	4	12		8	4	12		8					
Effort	7	39		4	7	37		4	7	40		4	2	32			
Employment	1	8			1	8			3	12							
Enterprises	3	15			3	15			3	15			3	18			
Expenditure	8	16		16	8	16		16	8	16		16					
Income	4	12		4	4	12		4	4	12		4	1	4			
Landings	42	172			42	170			42	180			46	180			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.5.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Estonia

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
EST																	
Capacity																	
Capital		27.0		16.5		50.0		8.0		61.5		8.0					
Effort	10.0	29.0		16.5	11.0	43.3		12.3	11.0	54.0		12.3					
Employment																	
Enterprises																	
Expenditure		27.0		16.5		50.4		16.5		42.8		16.5					
Income		27.5		16.5		55.8		16.5		53.8		16.5					
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Estonia in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.5.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Estonia

Other quality issues include:

- Information on fleet segment clustering not provided

## 6.6 FINLAND

### 6.6.1 Delivery of data

All Finnish data sheets were uploaded before the data call deadline. Following the data checking procedure, capital value and expenditure data were altered and resubmitted during the AER meeting in March, see table 6.6.1.

Table 6.6.1 Date of uploads for Finland

FIN Templates	2/27/2012	2/28/2012	3/29/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1	1		2
CAPACITY_TOT	1	1		2
CAPVALINVEST	1	1	1	3
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1	1	1	3
CLUSTER_DEFINITION		2		2
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1	1		2
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	3	1		4
EFFORT_TOT	1	1		2
EMPLOYMENT	1	1		2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1	1		2
EXPENDITURE	2	2	1	5
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1	2	1	4
FISHENT	1	1		2
FISHENT_TOT	1	1		2
INCOME	1	1		2
INCOME_TOT	1	1		2
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	2	1		3
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1	1		2
REC_CATCH		1		1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.6.2 Coverage

Table 6.6.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Finland. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.6.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent.

Table 6.6.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Finland 2008-2011.

	2008	2009	2010	2011
DFN	18	13	9	6
VL1218	18	13	9	6
INACTIVE	1687	1709	1662	1647
VL0010	1501	1513	1478	1474
VL1012	143	150	145	139
VL1218	37	42	36	34
VL1824	6	3	3	
VL2440		1		
PG	1486	1465	1559	1659
VL0010	1434	1421	1512	1620
VL1012	52	44	47	39
TM	49	53	51	53
VL1012				6
VL1218	20	22	22	15
VL1824	13	16	12	12
VL2440	16	15	17	20
Total	3240	3240	3281	3365

Table 6.6.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Finland 2008-2010.

FIN	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	3240		100%	3240		99%	3281		98%	3365	
TOT	3240	3240	100%	3240	3271	99%	3270	3365	97%	3365	3359
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	16440		102%	16930		102%	16728		101%	20275.9	
TOT	16440	16046	102%	16930	16535	102%	16384	16549	99%	16661	15623
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	173427		102%	174797		102%	175363		102%	181793	
TOT	173427	169707	102%	174797	171235	102%	171133	172216	99%	172827	169866
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	23105		121%	23815		132%	26628		137%	27490	
TOT	23105	19170	121%	23815	18043	132%	26645	19397	137%	27482	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	111581		123%	117541		139%	122100		147%	119727	
TOT	111481	90686	123%	117541	84400	139%	122100	82989	147%	119727	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.6.2 and 6.6.3, suggest that a full coverage of the data submitted, both at the national and fleet segment levels.



### 6.6.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Finland in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.6.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Finland

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>FIN</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>98</b>		<b>82</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>82</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>92</b>		<b>62</b>	<b>311</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
Capacity	4	40			4	44			4	40			4	40		4	
Capital	4	20	12		4	20	12		4	20	12						
Effort	12	61	6		12	65	6		12	61	6		10	55			
Employment	3	4	14		3	4	14		3	4	14						
Enterprises	3	18			3	18			3	18			3	21			
Expenditure	8	6	42		8	6	42		8	6	42						
Income	4		24		4	6	18		4	6	18		1	7			
Landings	42	150			42	162			42	187			42	175			2

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.6.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Finland

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>FIN</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital			40.0				43.3				43.3						
Effort	88.6	100	46.7		88.6	100	45.0		88.6	100	46.7		100	100			
Employment			42.9				46.4				47.9						
Enterprises																	
Expenditure			46.7				44.8				46.7						
Income			46.7				45.0				46.7						
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- No major quality issues identified

## 6.7 FRANCE

### 6.7.1 Delivery of data

Just over one third of the upload templates were submitted in time for the deadline. The rest of the data was submitted during the remainder of March. Following the coverage and quality checking procedures, a number of datasets were changed and resubmitted during and after both of the AER meetings. The last change France made to the database was on the 8 June 2012, see table 6.7.1.

Table 6.7.1 Date of uploads for France

FRA Templates	3/8/2012	3/9/2012	3/12/2012	3/16/2012	3/20/2012	3/21/2012	3/28/2012	4/2/2012	6/1/2012	6/6/2012	6/8/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1	2						2				5
CAPACITY_TOT	1	2						1				4
CAPVALINVEST						2						2
CAPVALINVEST_TOT						1						1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	1	1										2
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4						4						4
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA						8						8
EFFORT_TOT						1						1
EMPLOYMENT		3					1	1				5
EMPLOYMENT_TOT		1					1	1				3
EXPENDITURE		2			1							3
EXPENDITURE_TOT		1			1							2
FISHENT	3	2										5
FISHENT_TOT	1	2										3
INCOME		2	1									3
INCOME_TOT		1	1									2
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	3	8		1					2	2		16
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT				1							4	5
REC_CATCH		4										4

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.7.2 Coverage

Table 6.6.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for France. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.7.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.7.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for France 2008-2010.

	2008	2009	2010		2008	2009	2010
DFN	1501	1603	1422	MGP	115	148	125
VL0006	79	83	74	VL0010	23	29	23
VL0010	567	572	562	VL0612			2
VL0612	440	548	407	VL1012	49	51	49
VL1012	241	225	219	VL1218	29	51	35
VL1218	112	111	97	VL1824	4	5	3
VL1824	42	43	39	VL2440	10	12	13
VL2440	19	20	23	PGO	364	339	331
VL40XX	1	1	1	VL0006	71	74	68
DRB	288	270	267	VL0010	205	179	184
VL0006	7	4	3	VL0612	86	80	74
VL0010	82	75	74	VL1012	2	6	5
VL0612	12	12	9	PGP	932	961	926
VL1012	77	90	85	VL0006	66	55	58
VL1218	103	82	87	VL0010	768	775	766
VL1824	7	6	8	VL0612	72	104	75
VL2440		1	1	VL1012	24	20	22
DTS	880	761	730	VL1218		5	5
VL0010	111	99	96	VL1824	2		
VL0612	2	3		VL2440		1	
VL1012	188	157	155	VL40XX		1	
VL1218	203	174	164	PMP	202	172	169
VL1824	257	222	206	VL0006	5	3	9
VL2440	107	95	98	VL0010	81	76	65
VL40XX	12	11	11	VL0612	11	11	10
FPO	863	863	850	VL1012	95	73	72
VL0006	81	100	74	VL1218	9	9	11
VL0010	664	650	652	VL1824	1		
VL0612	31	24	33	VL2440			1
VL1012	63	66	65	VL40XX			1
VL1218	13	10	9	PS	135	126	110
VL1824	10	13	17	VL0010	31	29	21
VL40XX	1			VL0612	11	12	16
HOK	991	952	922	VL1012	3	2	2
VL0006	6	5	8	VL1218	27	28	30
VL0010	823	773	753	VL1824	9	7	7
VL0612	42	57	46	VL2440	21	19	10
VL1012	66	70	72	VL40XX	33	29	24
VL1218	30	24	26	TBB	10	7	7
VL1824	9	10	9	VL0010	1		
VL2440	15	13	8	VL1012	2		
MGO	249	198	176	VL1218	7	7	7
VL0006	1	1	1	TM	75	75	65
VL0010	223	171	151	VL0010			1
VL0612	14	12	13	VL1012	2	6	7
VL1012	10	13	11	VL1218	14	16	17
VL1218	1	1		VL1824	35	34	29
				VL2440	20	15	7
				VL40XX	4	4	4
				Grand Total	6605	6475	6100

Table 6.7.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for France 2008-2010.

FRA	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	6605	7941	83%	6475	7284	89%	6100	7242	84%		
TOT	6605		83%	6475		89%	6100		84%		
Gross tonnage											
FFT	188232	199269	94%	176348	185535	95%	163914	174461	94%		
TOT	188232		94%	176348		95%	163914		94%		
kW											
FFT	958312	1082260	89%	929414	1007735	92%	885137	996189	89%		
TOT	958312		89%	929414		92%	885137		89%		
Landings value											
FFT	903791	706194	128%	876354	785281	112%	924296	527092	175%		
TOT	903791		128%	876354		112%	924296		175%		
Landings weight											
FFT	433855	285861	152%	431420	319603	135%	447431	254876	176%	n/a	
TOT	433855		152%	431420		135%	447431		176%	n/a	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.7.2 and 6.7.3, suggest a good coverage of the DCF landings data but that a significant amount of capacity data had not been submitted. On the other hand, national and fleet segment totals match for all parameters and for all years analysed.

### 6.7.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by France in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.7.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by France

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>FRA</b>	<b>1860</b>	<b>8758</b>			<b>2758</b>	<b>42344</b>			<b>2027</b>	<b>16580</b>							
Capacity	4	428			4	420			4	412							
Capital	308				272				276								
Effort	62				145	960			163	2420							
Employment	234				210				207								
Enterprises	3	114			3	166			3	166							
Expenditure	540				488				484								
Income	232				276				208								
Landings	475	8109			1358	40693			680	13479							

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.7.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by France

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>FRA</b>																	
Capacity		100				100				100							
Capital	19.8				11.8				10.4								
Effort	25.5				21.1				77.7	100							
Employment	29.6				35.5				33.0								
Enterprises		100				100				100							
Expenditure	33.4				28.0				28.8								
Income	19.4				22.5				27.2								
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- Significant amount of missing data
- A change in methodology in 2010 has rendered, in some cases, incompatibility with previous year's data.
- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call

## 6.8 GERMANY

### 6.8.1 Delivery of data

All the requested data sets were uploaded before the data call deadline. Following checks by the JRC and the expert attending the AER meeting, a number of datasets were resubmitted during and after the EWG 12-03 AER meeting. The last uploading activity by Germany was on the 5 April 2012, see table 6.8.1.

Table 6.8.1 Date of uploads for Germany

DEU Templates	2/24/2012	3/7/2012	3/8/2012	3/9/2012	3/22/2012	3/23/2012	3/27/2012	3/30/2012	4/5/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1	1						1		3
CAPACITY_TOT	1	1						1		3
CAPVALINVEST			3	1	1					5
CAPVALINVEST_TOT			2	1	1					4
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	2	1								3
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4		1		1					1	3
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA		1		1					1	3
EFFORT_TOT		1		1					1	3
EMPLOYMENT				1	1					2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT				1	1					2
EXPENDITURE			3	2	1		1			7
EXPENDITURE_TOT			1	1	1		1			4
FISHENT		1								1
FISHENT_TOT		1								1
INCOME				1	1	2				4
INCOME_TOT				1	1	2				4
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4		5							2	7
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT		3							2	5
REC_CATCH			1							1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.8.2 Coverage

Table 6.8.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Germany. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.8.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent.

Table 6.8.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Germany 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	23	23	19	16	14
VL1218	16	16	12	10	8
VL1824	2	2	2	2	2
VL2440	5	5	5	4	4
DRB	7	6	7	12	12
VL1218	1	1	1	1	1
VL2440	3	4	4	6	6
VL40XX	3	1	2	5	5
DTS	108	106	107	99	87
VL0010	2	2	1	1	1
VL1012	14	13	15	15	14
VL1218	41	39	37	33	31
VL1824	31	28	30	29	22
VL2440	12	16	16	13	11
VL40XX	8	8	8	8	8
FPO	2	3	2	3	3
VL1218	1	1	1	1	1
VL2440	1	2	1	2	2
HOK		1			
VL1218		1			
INACTIVE	513	505	497	438	370
VL0010	485	468	458	387	347
VL1012	7	8	8	12	9
VL1218	11	12	19	27	8
VL1824	4	6	5	7	3
VL2440	5	7	5	5	3
VL40XX	1	4	2		
PG	960	937	902	883	875
VL0010	884	861	830	817	811
VL1012	76	76	72	66	64
TBB	245	231	223	216	215
VL0010	17	15	10	13	12
VL1012	6	5	6	6	5
VL1218	147	140	134	127	127
VL1824	64	63	61	61	62
VL2440	9	7	10	8	8
VL40XX	2	1	2	1	1
TM	12	6	9	10	9
VL1012	1				
VL1218	1				
VL1824			2	1	1
VL2440	5	2	2	4	3
VL40XX	5	4	5	5	5
Total	1870	1818	1766	1677	1585

Table 6.8.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Germany 2008-2012.

DEU	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	1870	1828	102%	1818	1769	103%	1766	1680	105%	1677	1585
TOT	1870		102%	1818		103%	1766		105%	1677	1585
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	69075	69135	100%	61318	68161	90%	68156	67765	101%	67728	64843
TOT	69075		100%	61318		90%	68156		101%	67728	64843
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	160794	161248	100%	155789	161507	96%	161458	159714	101%	159391	149641
TOT	160794		100%	155789		96%	161458		101%	159391	149641
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	163571	127108	129%	128423	90248	142%	141113	124859	113%	154768	
TOT	163572		129%	128423		142%	141113		113%	154700	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	116986	225246	52%	117672	245186	48%	92243	250456	37%	97443	
TOT	116986		52%	117672		48%	92243		37%	97333	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.8.2 and 6.8.3, suggest an almost complete coverage of the data submitted. No significant discrepancies found for capacity data between both data sources. Conversely, significant differences in landings data were observed: whereas the value of landings appears to have a good coverage in the DCF data (higher than the figures reported by Eurostat), the volumes of landings reported in DCF are less than half of that reported by Eurostat.

### 6.8.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Germany in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.8.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Germany

N	2008					2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	NSS/PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
DEU																		
Capacity	4	132				4	128			4	128			4	124		4	124
Capital	32	14	9	6		4	45		14	4	55		14					
Effort	25	323	4	4	3	11	341		15	11	310		15	9	271	8		
Employment	3	24	12	9		3	45		3	3	30		21					
Enterprises	3	46				3	45			3	46			3	45			
Expenditure	7	80	24	18		8	109		36	8	110		35					
Income	4	29	7	6		4	44		21	4	42		14	1	14			
Landings	134	2076				154	2046			151	1921			145	1714			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; NSS/PSS combination survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided



Table 6.8.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Germany

%	2008					2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	NSS/PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
DEU	97.2	86.8	46.9	43.3	22.3	80.7	86.3		36.3	80.7	82.7		39.2	85.8	99.0	100		
Capacity																		
Capital	100	30.3	35.4	22.3			77.0		31.9		69.8		35.6					
Effort	93.3	96.8	36.3	100.0	22.3	77.5	96.7		68.2	77.5	96.1		69.9	83.0	98.7	100		
Employment		100	100	100			88.0		10.0		25.5		33.0					
Enterprises		100					100				100				100			
Expenditure		57.2	46.9	35.3			63.8		31.3		62.1		35.6					
Income		59.4	37.3	22.3			54.4		29.0		75.6		28.0		100			
Landings																		

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; combination survey; NSS/PSS combination survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- A significant proportion of the German national fleets landings are made by a small number of pelagic vessels which are owned by a single fishing enterprise. Due to confidentiality reasons, all the data relating to these vessels were not submitted.

## 6.9 GREECE

### 6.9.1 Delivery of data

No data submitted during the 2012 call on fleet economic data.

### 6.9.2 Coverage

### 6.9.2 Quality

## 6.10 IRELAND

### 6.10.1 Delivery of data

Ireland submitted all the requested datasets in time for the deadline. Following JRC quality checking procedures and dialogue with the Irish authorities some data was adjusted and datasets re-submitted in before and after the AER meeting in March, see table 6.10.1.

Table 6.10.1 Date of uploads for Ireland

IRL	3/2/2012	3/9/2012	3/15/2012	3/27/2012	4/12/2012	upload attempts
Templates						
CAPACITY	2					2
CAPACITY_TOT	1					1
CAPVALINVEST		1	1			2
CAPVALINVEST_TOT		1	1			2
CLUSTER_DEFINITION		1		1		2
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4		4			1	5
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA		13			1	14
EFFORT_TOT		2			1	3
EMPLOYMENT		1		1		2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT		1		1		2
EXPENDITURE		2				2
EXPENDITURE_TOT		1				1
FISHENT		1				1
FISHENT_TOT		1				1
INCOME		2				2
INCOME_TOT		1				1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4		6				6
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT		1				1
REC_CATCH		1				1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.10.2 Coverage

Table 6.10.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Ireland. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.10.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.10.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Ireland 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	190	388	412	429	519	PGP	3	3	3	2	
VL0010	134	328	353	372	392	VL0010		1	1	1	
VL1012	37	44	43	40	64	VL1012	3	2	2	1	
VL1218	9	8	8	8	32	PMP	4	3	3	2	
VL1824	8	5	5	6	20	VL1012	2				
VL2440	2	3	3	3	11	VL1218	2	3	3	2	
DRB	244	422	454	465	508	PS	3	11	11	11	20
VL0010	140	318	346	354	367	VL0010		5	7	8	8
VL1012	48	51	53	58	80	VL1012					2
VL1218	12	13	16	15	22	VL1218		4	4	3	2
VL1824	8	6	6	6	9	VL1824	1	1			5
VL2440	32	30	29	28	26	VL2440	2	1			2
VL40XX	4	4	4	4	4	VL40XX					1
DTS	219	193	203	200	68	TBB	18	16	16	15	8
VL0010	9	25	28	31	14	VL0010		3	2	2	1
VL1012	23	24	25	25	5	VL1012			1		
VL1218	69	58	57	52	7	VL1824	7	7	7	7	3
VL1824	82	59	64	65	23	VL2440	11	6	6	6	4
VL2440	33	27	29	27	19	TM	60	130	131	129	213
VL40XX	3					VL0010	5	54	60	59	61
FPO	1196	826	839	850	793	VL1012	6	19	18	15	45
VL0010	1032	688	699	714	731	VL1218	4	12	11	13	34
VL1012	132	111	114	110	55	VL1824	10	10	8	6	31
VL1218	25	20	19	20	6	VL2440	16	14	14	15	24
VL1824	4	4	4	3		VL40XX	19	21	20	21	18
VL2440	3	3	3	3	1	<b>Total</b>	<b>1955</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2109</b>	<b>2144</b>	<b>2188</b>
HOK	18	34	37	41	59						
VL0010	12	24	27	31	51						
VL1012	5	8	8	8	4						
VL1218					3						
VL2440	1	2	2	2	1						

Table 6.10.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Ireland 2008-2012.

IRL	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	1955	2023	97%	2026	2109	96%	2109	2148	98%	2144	2188
TOT	1955		97%	2026		96%	2109		98%	2144	2188
Gross tonnage											
FFT	70699	69867	101%	69888	68759	102%	68692	69427	99%	69407	63004
TOT	70699		101%	69888		102%	68692		99%	69407	63004
kW											
FFT	206896	193409	107%	193585	193893	100%	193928	198013	98%	195289	191855
TOT	206896		107%	193585		100%	193928		98%	195289	191855
Landings value											
FFT	196489	249665	79%	185934	236000	79%	202111	288286	70%		
TOT	196489		79%	185934		79%	202111		70%		
Landings weight											
FFT	198004	209667	94%	262562	247050	106%	314203	247841	127%	n/a	
TOT	198004		94%	262562		106%	314203		127%	n/a	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.10.2 and 6.10.3, suggest an almost complete coverage of the capacity data submitted, with no significant discrepancies between the two data sources. Conversely, significant

differences in the landings data (in value) were observed, with the DCF data corresponding to only 70-79% of the values reported in Eurostat statistics. National and fleet segment totals match for all parameters for all years analysed.

#### 6.10.2 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Ireland in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.10.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Ireland

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
IRL	283	6624	387		294	5101	428		313	5257	415		8	238		5	195
Capacity	4	152			4	160			4	156			4	152		4	156
Capital	29		75		32		84		31		81						
Effort	6	503	12		6	465	12		6	426	12						
Employment	3		75		3		84		3		81						
Enterprises	2	49			2	51			2	49			3	48			
Expenditure	7		175		7		192		7		187						
Income	3	18	50		3	17	56		3	15	54						
Landings	228	5864			236	4368			256	4572							

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.10.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Ireland

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
IRL																	
Capacity		100				100				100				100			100
Capital	16.6		11.8		18.0		8.7		5.5		7.5						
Effort	7.5		42.9		6.5		52.8		6.2		17.6						
Employment			27.9				25.7				10.9						
Enterprises		100				100				100				100			
Expenditure			16.9				16.2				6.2						
Income		100	12.4			100	12.2			100	4.6						
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- Some missing data for several fleet segments
- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call

## 6.11 ITALY

### 6.11.1 Delivery of data

All datasets were submitted before the data call deadline. Following quality checking procedures by JRC and the Italian national expert, some data sets were adjusted and re-submitted during and after the EWG 12-03 AER meeting, see table 6.11.1.

Table 6.11.1 Date of uploads for Italy

ITA Templates	3/2/2012	3/5/2012	3/8/2012	3/27/2012	3/28/2012	5/31/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1			1			2
CAPACITY_TOT	1			1			2
CAPVALINVEST	1						1
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1						1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	1						1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4			1				1
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA			2				2
EFFORT_TOT			1				1
EMPLOYMENT			1		1		2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT			1		1		2
EXPENDITURE		2				2	4
EXPENDITURE_TOT		1				2	3
FISHENT	1			1			2
FISHENT_TOT	1			1			2
INCOME		1		1			2
INCOME_TOT		1		1			2
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4			1				1
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT			1				1
REC_CATCH	1						1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.11.2 Coverage

Table 6.11.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Ireland. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.11.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent.

Table 6.11.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Italy 2008-2011

	2008	2009	2010	2011
DRB	702.5	706.58	699.3	708
VL1218	702.5	706.58	699.3	708
DTS	2633.33	2620.41	2603.38	2581.34
VL0612	111.08	169.08	172.08	177.67
VL1218	1478.58	1411.58	1400.85	1424.33
VL1824	758.25	751.75	739.62	730.67
VL2440	268.42	271	274.83	232.67
VL40XX	17	17	16	16
HOK	238	197.58	176.24	190.33
VL1218	183.08	144.58	125.89	142.33
VL1824	54.92	53	50.35	48
INACTIVE	1568	1603	1685	1396
VL0006	367	359	389	273
VL0612	825	862	885	824
VL1218	337	338	330	255
VL1824	34	37	45	42
VL2440	5	7	12	2
VL40XX			24	
PGP	9310.34	9273.5	9265.16	9281
VL0006	2887.5	2883.08	2836.17	2820.67
VL0612	5984.17	5944.92	5939.67	6012
VL1218	438.67	445.5	489.32	448.33
PMP	59.92	51.17	89.59	79.66
VL0612		11.92	37	42.33
VL1218	59.92	39.25	52.59	37.33
PS	297.83	316.34	231.49	260.33
VL1218	167.83	144.5	125.66	131.67
VL1824	55.33	80.42	47	47.33
VL2440	49.67	66.42	58.83	64.33
VL40XX	25	25		17
TBB	74.33	72.16	72.31	71
VL1218	13	13	11.96	12
VL1824	26.33	25.83	26.33	27.33
VL2440	35	33.33	34.02	31.67
TM	154	136.26	146.93	147
VL1218	31.83	32.92	37.47	26
VL1824	43.17	25.17	35.83	44
VL2440	79	78.17	73.63	77
Total	15038.25	14977	14969.4	14714.66

Table 6.11.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Italy 2008-2011.

ITA	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	15038	13683	110%	14977	13587	110%	14969	13515	111%	14714.7	
TOT	15038		110%	14977		110%	14969		111%	14714.7	
Gross tonnage											
FFT	199007	196313	101%	197627	193672	102%	191211	186079	103%	185037	
TOT	199007		101%	197627		102%	191211		103%	185037	
kW											
FFT	1272822	1149081	111%	1270662	1136685	112%	1118610	1111984	101%	1236529	
TOT	1272822		111%	1270662		112%	1118610		101%	1236529	
Landings value											
FFT	1105644	1106913	100%	1202010	1209971	99%	1114860	1147509	97%		
TOT	1105644		100%	1202010		99%	1102759		96%		
Landings weight											
FFT	227011	227160	100%	242437	242581	100%	224758	229236	98%	n/a	
TOT	227011		100%	242437		100%	223007		97%	n/a	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.11.2 and 6.11.3, suggest a good coverage of the data submitted by Italy in terms of the parameters analysed. No significant discrepancies between the two data sources were observed. Additionally, national and fleet segment totals match relatively well for all years reported.

### 6.11.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Italy in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.11.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Italy

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
ITA	298	346	13	3702	265	366	13	3960	259	315	6	3970	5	140			
Capacity	4	112			4	116			4	112			4	112			
Capital	3	50		19	3	58		19	2	56		19					
Effort	45	11	2	184	14	12	2	241	29			227					
Employment	3	3		60	3	3		63	3			63					
Enterprises	3	66			3	55			3	61							
Expenditure	8	22	11	103	8	23	11	109	8	22	6	109					
Income	2	24		20	2	22		21	2	20		21					
Landings	224	30		3316	226	48		3502	206	16		3526					

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided



Table 6.11.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Italy

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>ITA</b>																	
Capacity		100				100				100				100			
Capital		100		11.5		100		11.5		100		11.5					
Effort	21.6	100		24.7	24.5	100		22.9	20.9			21.6					
Employment		100		25.2		100		24.4				22.7					
Enterprises		100				100				100							
Expenditure		100		24.8		100		23.9		100		22.3					
Income		100		25.2		100		24.4		100		22.7					
Landings	11.4	100		21.7	11.8	100		22.2	11.6	100		21.1					

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues include:

- No capacity and effort data for 2011 provided
- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call

## 6.12 LATVIA

### 6.12.1 Delivery of data

All requested datasets were submitted before the data call deadline. Following quality checking procedures by JRC and the Latvian national expert, some data sets were re-submitted after the EWG 12-03 AER meeting, see table 6.12.1.

Table 6.12.1 Date of uploads for Latvia

LVA Templates	2/22/2012	2/27/2012	4/16/2012	4/18/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1				1
CAPACITY_TOT	1				1
CAPVALINVEST	1				1
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1				1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	1				1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1				1
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	1				1
EFFORT_TOT	1				1
EMPLOYMENT		1	1		2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT		1	1		2
EXPENDITURE		1			1
EXPENDITURE_TOT		1			1
FISHENT	1				1
FISHENT_TOT	1				1
INCOME		1			1
INCOME_TOT		1			1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4		1	1	4	6
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT		1		1	2
REC_CATCH	1				1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.12.2 Coverage

Table 6.12.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Latvia. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.12.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent.

Table 6.12.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Latvia 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	26	23	18	10	13
VL2440	26	23	18	10	13
PGP	736	708	687	683	644
VL0010	736	708	687	683	644
TM	96	83	66	65	65
VL1218	30	23	17	17	17
VL2440	66	60	49	48	48
Total	858	814	771	758	722

Table 6.12.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Latvia 2008-2012.

LVA	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	858	841	102%	814	794	103%	771	786	98%	758	722
TOT	858		102%	814		103%	771		98%	758	722
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	12867	38228	34%	12368	41186	30%	9755	40762	24%	9054	8995
TOT	12867		34%	12368		30%	9755		24%	9054	8995
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	34200	61080	56%	32701	62456	52%	26694	61454	43%	25492	24957
TOT	34200		56%	32701		52%	26694		43%	25492	24957
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	23144	20304	114%	17454	13556	129%	21036	12774	165%	20744	
TOT	23144		114%	17454		129%	21036		165%	20744	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	86470	85767	101%	78464	71531	110%	74017	67134	110%	59796	
TOT	86470		101%	78464		110%	74017		110%	59796	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.12.2 and 6.12.3, suggest that significant amounts of capacity (GT and kW) data have not been reported in DCF. Conversely, DCF landings data are higher than the figures reported by Eurostat. National and fleet segment totals match for all parameters for all years analysed.

### 6.12.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Latvia in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.12.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Latvia

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
LVA	49	253			51	242			51	223			31	147		5	20
Capacity	4	16			4	16			4	16			4	16		4	16
Capital	1	4			2	8			2	8							
Effort	10	63			10	54			10	47			8	39			
Employment	3	12			3	12			3	12							
Enterprises	3	12			3	12			3	12			3	12			
Expenditure	7	28			8	32			8	32							
Income	4	16			4	16			4	16			1	4			
Landings	16	98			16	88			16	76			14	72			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.12.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Latvia

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>LVA</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital																	
Effort																	
Employment																	
Enterprises																	
Expenditure																	
Income																	
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

## 6.13 LITHUANIA

### 6.13.1 Delivery of data

All datasets were submitted on or before the data call deadline, apart from clustering definitions. Following quality checking procedures by JRC and the Lithuanian national experts, some data were adjusted and datasets re-submitted during and after the AER meeting, see table 6.13.1.

Table 6.13.1 Date of uploads for Lithuania

LTU Templates	2/20/2012	2/22/2012	3/8/2012	3/9/2012	3/27/2012	3/28/2012	4/10/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY			2			1		3
CAPACITY_TOT			1			1		2
CAPVALINVEST	1							1
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1							1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION					1			1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4				3		2		5
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA			1	5		2		8
EFFORT_TOT				3		2		5
EMPLOYMENT	1							1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1							1
EXPENDITURE	1	2						3
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1	1						2
FISHENT		1						1
FISHENT_TOT		1						1
INCOME	1							1
INCOME_TOT	1							1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4			2	4		1	1	8
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT				2		1	1	4
REC_CATCH			1					1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.13.2 Coverage

Table 6.13.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Lithuania. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.13.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.13.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Lithuania 2004-2011

	2008	2009	2010	2011
DFN	89	90	77	69
VL0010	75	76	63	60
VL1218	14	14	14	9
DTS	21	22	18	20
VL2440	21	22	18	20
INACTIVE	126	96	83	68
VL0010	89	74	65	53
VL1012	18	9	8	6
VL1218	3	3	2	2
VL1824			1	1
VL2440	11	5	5	4
VL40XX	5	5	2	2
TM	14	11	15	14
VL2440	3	3	4	4
VL40XX	11	8	11	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>171</b>

Table 6.13.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Lithuania 2008-2011.

LTU	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	250	221	113%	219	193	113%	193	171	113%	171	
TOT	250		113%	219		113%	193		113%	171	
Gross tonnage											
FFT	60965	50478	121%	50434	49286	102%	49840	45961	108%	45963	
TOT	60965		121%	50434		102%	49840		108%	45963	
kW											
FFT	66759	59794	112%	58557	56381	104%	57718	54392	106%	54395	
TOT	66759		112%	58557		104%	57718		106%	54395	
Landings value											
FFT	84306	6306	1337%	85274	6661	1280%	60002	4987	1203%	68019	
TOT	84306		1337%	85275		1280%	59859		1200%	68019	
Landings weight											
FFT	176083	7532	2338%	207166	9128	2270%	107543	5536	1943%	112180	
TOT	176083		2338%	207166		2270%	107543		1943%	112180	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.13.2 and 6.13.3, suggest significant discrepancies between the two data sources. However, the DCF data for all parameters analysed were found to be higher than the figures reported by Eurostat. National and fleet segment totals match for all parameters for all years analysed.

### 6.13.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Lithuania in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.13.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Lithuania

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
LTU	191	572			132	472			158	532			131	445			
Capacity	4	40			4	40			4	44			4	44			
Capital	4	30			4	30			4	30							
Effort	10	54			11	105			11	111			9	113			
Employment	3	15			3	15			3	15							
Enterprises	3	15			3	15			3	15			3	15			
Expenditure	8	40			8	40			8	40							
Income	4	20			4	20			4	20							
Landings	154	348			94	197			120	246			114	262			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.13.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Lithuania

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
LTU																	
Capacity		NR				NR				NR				NR			
Capital		56.1				76.0				84.9							
Effort	NR	100			NR	100			NR	100			NR	NR			
Employment		34.2				64.0				77.4							
Enterprises		100				100				100				100			
Expenditure		42.4				68.5				80.2							
Income		50.7				82.0				88.7							
Landings	NR				NR				NR				NR	NR			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

#### Other quality issues:

- No major issues
- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call

## 6.14 MALTA

### 6.14.1 Delivery of data

All DCF datasets were submitted before the data call deadline. Further changes were made to Maltese effort, capacity, capital value, employment, fishing enterprises and expenditure on several occasions, prior to and after the two AER meetings, see table 6.14.1.

Table 6.14.1 Date of uploads for Malta

MLT Templates	3/8/2012	3/22/2012	4/13/2012	6/12/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	1		1		2
CAPACITY_TOT	1		1		2
CAPVALINVEST	3	3			6
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1	1			2
CLUSTER_DEFINITION					
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	4		6		10
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	10		11		21
EFFORT_TOT	2		2		4
EMPLOYMENT	1			1	2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1			1	2
EXPENDITURE	4		1		5
EXPENDITURE_TOT	2		1		3
FISHENT	2		1		3
FISHENT_TOT	1		1		2
INCOME	1				1
INCOME_TOT	1				1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1				1
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1				1
REC_CATCH	2				2

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.14.2 Coverage

Table 6.14.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Malta. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.14.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.



Table 6.14.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Malta 2005-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	23	4	19	4	19	MGO	21	34	23	43	3
VL0006	19	2	16	2	17	VL0006	1	2	1	2	1
VL0612	4	2	2	1	1	VL0612	11	22	12	29	2
VL1218			1		1	VL1218	9	10	9		
VL1224				1		VL1224				12	
DTS	14	17	22	20	22	VL1824			1		
VL1224				14		MGP					1
VL1824	12	13	15		14	VL1218					1
VL2440	2	4	7	6	8	PGP	353	476	602	369	662
FPO	11	15	12	11	11	VL0006	211	295	391	216	424
VL0006	9	11	8	8	7	VL0612	142	181	211	153	234
VL0612	2	4	4	3	4	VL1218					2
HOK	247	201	149	164	89	VL1824					1
VL0006	63	40	44	34	41	VL2440					1
VL0612	144	124	64	101	38	PMP	32	29	169	20	226
VL1218	28	23	22		1	VL0006	7	2	20	1	22
VL1224				27		VL0612	20	18	141	13	168
VL1824	10	12	15		8	VL1218	4	6	8		23
VL2440	2	2	4	2	1	VL1224				4	
INACTIVE	613	332	114	453	17	VL1824	1	2			11
VL0006	352	186	58	268	3	VL2440		1		2	2
VL0612	231	125	44	167	7	PS	2	3	2	3	
VL1218	20	10	6		5	VL0612		1		1	
VL1224				14		VL1218		1	2		
VL1824	6	8	4		2	VL1224				2	
VL2440	4	3	1	3		VL2440	2	1			
VL40XX			1	1		Total	1316	1111	1112	1087	1050

Table 6.14.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Malta 2008-2012.

MLT	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	1316		114%	1111		100%	1112		102%	1087	1050
TOT	1316	1152	114%	1111	1112	100%	1112	1093	102%	1087	1050
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	7472		68%	8295		69%	12303		103%	12107	8068
TOT	7472	10961	68%	8295	12030	69%	12303	11992	103%	12107	8068
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	87520		102%	82212		94%	85459		100%	83375	77683
TOT	87520	86161	102%	82212	87027	94%	85459	85529	100%	83375	77683
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	8170		98%	8554		97%	8841		99%	11374	
TOT	8170	8319	98%	8554	8783	97%	8841	8901	99%	11374	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	1281		99%	1587		99%	1836		99%	1921	
TOT	1281	1298	99%	1587	1607	99%	1836	1845	99%	1921	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.14.2 and 6.14.3, suggest that some capacity (gross tonnage) data has not been reported for years 2008 and 2009, otherwise no significant discrepancies between the two data sources were observed. Additionally, national and fleet segment totals match for all parameters for all years analysed.

### 6.14.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Malta in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.14.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Malta

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>MLT</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>1141</b>		<b>680</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>1208</b>		<b>828</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>1296</b>		<b>598</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>1309</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>145</b>
Capacity	4	104			4	116			4	112			4	108		4	116
Capital	4			82	4			78	4	70		18					
Effort	6	49		30	6	52		57	10	65		69	10	83	28		
Employment	3			54	3			51	3			54					
Enterprises	3	78			3	87			3	75			3	87			
Expenditure	7			126	8			136	8	26		126					
Income	3			54	4			68	4			72	1	18			
Landings	202	884		334	196	924		438	246	918		258	236	982	246		

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.14.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Malta

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>MLT</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital				47.7				43.3				49.2					
Effort	81.0	100		70.6	72.5	100		61.2	91.6	100		69.2	100	100	100		
Employment				51.0				45.7				49.2					
Enterprises																	
Expenditure				51.0				45.7				49.2					
Income				51.0				45.7				49.2					
Landings	100	100		100	100	100		100	100	100		100	100	100			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Some missing data for several fleet segments
- No cluster information provided

## 6.15 THE NETHERLANDS

### 6.15.1 Delivery of data

Most of the requested datasets were submitted on the data call deadline, with the exception of cluster definition and recreational catches, which was submitted almost three weeks later. Following quality checking procedures by the JRC and the Dutch national expert, some data was adjusted and datasets re-submitted during the AER meeting in March, see table 6.15.1.

Table 6.15.1 Date of uploads for The Netherlands

NLD Templates	3/9/2012	3/28/2012	4/13/2012	upload attempt
CAPACITY	5			5
CAPACITY_TOT	4			4
CAPVALINVEST	1	2	1	4
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1	2	1	4
CLUSTER_DEFINITION		3		3
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	6	2	1	9
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	2	2	1	5
EFFORT_TOT	3	2	1	6
EMPLOYMENT	2	1	1	4
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1	1	1	3
EXPENDITURE	2	2	1	5
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1	1	1	3
FISHENT	5			5
FISHENT_TOT	2			2
INCOME	2	1		3
INCOME_TOT	1	1		2
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	6			6
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	3			3
REC_CATCH		4		4

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.15.2 Coverage

Table 6.15.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for the Netherlands. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.15.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent.

Table 6.15.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for The Netherlands 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DRB	18	16	16	16	20
VL0010	18	16	16	16	20
DTS	49	51	59	62	63
VL0010	19	14	27	25	27
VL1824	12	13	12	14	17
VL2440	18	24	20	23	19
INACTIVE	127	143	145	168	182
VL0010	77	86	79	104	118
VL1012	5	7	8	6	6
VL1218	11	14	15	17	15
VL1824	7	7	11	11	18
VL2440	14	17	19	19	17
VL40XX	13	12	13	11	8
PG	197	202	207	199	195
VL0010	197	202	207	199	195
PGP	16	9	5	4	4
VL1218	16	9	5	4	4
TBB	306	278	280	277	263
VL1218	12	10	12	11	25
VL1824	172	173	170	170	157
VL2440	39	31	34	32	22
VL40XX	83	64	64	64	59
TM	13	13	13	12	13
VL40XX	13	13	13	12	13
Total	726	712	725	738	740

Table 6.15.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for The Netherlands 2008-2012

NLD	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	726	825	88%	712	838	85%	725	849	85%	738	740
TOT	726		88%	712		85%	725		85%	738	740
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	145859	146925	99%	129403	154369	84%	137195	147520	93%	130522	133698
TOT	145859		99%	129403		84%	137195		93%	130522	133698
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	332213	344073	97%	288572	348381	83%	293784	343146	86%	290121	286483
TOT	332213		97%	288572		83%	293784		86%	290121	286483
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	365719	n/a		319299	n/a		354631	n/a		295532	
TOT	365719			319299			354631			295532	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	388487	882233	44%	335251			381610			261680	
TOT	388487		44%	335251			381610			261680	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.15.2 and 6.15.3, suggest some significant discrepancies for the capacity and landings parameters analysed between the two data sources for years when information is available. In particular, the data suggests that significant amounts of data were not reported on landings (in weight) for 2008 in the DCF (all other years cannot be evaluated due to insufficient information). However, national and fleet segment totals match for all parameters for all years analysed.

### 6.15.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by The Netherlands in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.15.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by The Netherlands

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>NLD</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>1984</b>		<b>111</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>1971</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>2427</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>2215</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>85</b>
Capacity	4	68			4	68			4	68			4	68		4	68
Capital	4	17		24	4	13		24	3	17		24					
Effort	7	259		6	7	275		6	7	293		6	5	237			
Employment	3	12		21	3	9		18	3	12		18					
Enterprises	3	26			3	27			3	26			3	27			
Expenditure	8	32		48	8	32		48	8	29		48					
Income	4	15		12	4	16		12	4	13		12	1	10			
Landings	198	1538			180	1514			246	1952			290	1856			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.15.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Netherlands

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>NLD</b>																	
Capacity		100				100				100				100			100
Capital		46.1		30.6		47.9		30.3		56.0		28.9					
Effort	66.5	99.2		30.7	65.0	99.5		30.4	65.0	99.4		28.4	100	100			
Employment		40.0		28.5		51.0		30.4		59.8		28.4					
Enterprises		100				100				100				100			
Expenditure		42.0		30.7		43.3		30.4		57.4		28.4					
Income		100		30.7		100		30.4		100		28.4		100			
Landings	100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Completeness of landings data questionable

## 6.16 POLAND

### 6.16.1 Delivery of data

All datasets were submitted before the data call deadline, with the expectation of cluster definition, which was uploaded on a later date along with other re-submissions during and after the AER meeting in March 2012, see table 6.16.1

Table 6.16.1 Date of uploads for Poland

POL Templates	3/8/2012	3/9/2012	3/27/2012	3/29/2012	4/10/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY	3		2	1		6
CAPACITY_TOT	1		1	1		3
CAPVALINVEST	1					1
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1					1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION			1			1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1		2			3
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	2		2			4
EFFORT_TOT	1		2			3
EMPLOYMENT	1					1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1					1
EXPENDITURE	1					1
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1					1
FISHENT	3	1				4
FISHENT_TOT	1	1				2
INCOME	1				1	2
INCOME_TOT	1				1	2
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1				1	2
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1				1	2
REC_CATCH	1					1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.16.2 Coverage

Table 6.16.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Poland. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.16.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.16.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Poland 2008-2011

	2008	2009	2010	2011
DFN	86	25	22	15
VL1218	86	25	22	15
DTS	120	85	90	91
VL1012			12	
VL1218	59	52	47	70
VL1824	34	22	20	20
VL2440	25	10	10	
VL40XX	2	1	1	1
HOK		37	37	27
VL1218		37	37	27
INACTIVE	42	109	99	84
VL0010	31	48	46	43
VL0012	2	10	17	16
VL1218	5	38	25	17
VL1824	2	4	6	6
VL2440	2	9	5	2
PG	576	556	526	527
VL0010	503	490	472	447
VL1012	73	66	54	80
TM	59	65	49	61
VL1824				14
VL2440	56	61	46	44
VL40XX	3	4	3	3
Total	883	877	823	805

Table 6.16.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Poland 2008-2012.

POL	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	883	833	106%	877	807	109%	823	793	104%	805	790
TOT	883		106%	877		109%	823		104%	805	
Gross tonnage											
FFT	45709	40971	112%	49143	38249	128%	38433	37269	103%	37968	33377
TOT	45710		112%	49143		128%	38433		103%	37968	
kW											
FFT	108649	98958	110%	106350	90701	117%	91722	86854	106%	88067	82890
TOT	108649		110%	106350		117%	91722		106%	88067	
Landings value											
FFT	34756	34232	102%	37277	37956	98%	39957	41466	96%	46046	46046
TOT	34756		102%	37277		98%	39957		96%	46046	
Landings weight											
FFT	126150	65790	192%	212126	80147	265%	170771	84013	203%	179906	179906
TOT	126150		192%	212126		265%	170771		203%	179906	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.16.2 and 6.16.3, suggest a higher coverage of the parameters analysed in the DCF data as opposed to the reported Eurostat figures, in particular for landings volume. For DCF data, national and fleet segment totals equate for all parameters for all years analysed.

### 6.16.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Poland in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.16.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Poland

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>POL</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>484</b>		<b>98</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>525</b>		<b>104</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>572</b>		<b>99</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>450</b>		<b>5</b>	
Capacity	4	56			4	60			4	64			4	60		4	
Capital	4	12		21	4	13		24	29	14							
Effort	10	99		7	10	112		8	10	115		9	9	89			
Employment	3			21	3			24	3			27					
Enterprises	3	22			3	24			3	25			3	25			
Expenditure	6			42	6			48	6			54					
Income	3	19		7	2	20			3	18		9					
Landings	90	260			92	278			101	317			101	258			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.16.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Poland

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>POL</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital		100		39.7		1		39.5	49.7								
Effort	88.5	100		39.7	89.3	100		39.5	90.3	100		49.4	100	100			
Employment				39.7				39.5				49.4					
Enterprises																	
Expenditure				39.7				39.5				49.4					
Income		100		39.7		100				100		49.4					
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- No major issues
- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call



## 6.17 PORTUGAL

### 6.17.1 Delivery of data

All datasets were submitted on the data call deadline. Following quality checking procedures by the JRC and the Portuguese national expert, some data were adjusted and datasets re-submitted before, during and after both AER meetings, the latest changes taking place on the 5 June 2012, see table 6.17.1.

Table 6.17.1 Date of uploads for Portugal

PRT	3/9/2012	3/26/2012	3/28/2012	4/13/2012	4/16/2012	6/1/2012	6/5/2012	upload attempt
Templates								
CAPACITY	1		1					2
CAPACITY_TOT	1		1					2
CAPVALINVEST	2	1						3
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1	1						2
CLUSTER_DEFINITION								
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	6	1	1			1		9
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	1	1	1			1		4
EFFORT_TOT	7	1	1			1		10
EMPLOYMENT	1	1						2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1	1						2
EXPENDITURE	1	1						2
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1	1						2
FISHENT	2							2
FISHENT_TOT	1							1
INCOME	1	1						2
INCOME_TOT	1	1						2
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	5			10	1	4	1	21
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	2			3	1	1	1	8
REC_CATCH								

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.17.2 Coverage

Tables 6.17.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Portugal. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programme. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment these tables, we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information. In Portugal's case, no cluster information was provided.

Table 6.17.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Portugal 2003-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	743	749	683	623	241	INACTIVE	3466	3512	3622	3614	3890
VL0010	636	609	551	510	227	VL0010	3267	3299	3390	3391	3640
VL1012	20	24	23	18	8	VL1012	46	56	54	53	65
VL1218	66	86	85	70	5	VL1218	69	77	100	101	108
VL1824	21		24	25	1	VL1824	39	36	35	34	40
VL18XX		30				VL2440	38	38	33	26	28
DRB	72	70	75	73	67	VL40XX	7	6	10	9	9
VL0010	33	32	33	37	34	MGP	7	24	21	17	6
VL1012	22	22	25	22	20	VL0010	7	24	17	14	3
VL1218	17	16	17	14	13	VL1824			4	3	3
DTS	205	207	179	183	168	PGP	1659	1693	1682	1716	1993
VL0010	81	81	76	75	58	VL0010	1560	1618	1629	1633	1712
VL1012	8	9	6	10	10	VL1012	19	24	23	31	59
VL1218	12	12	9	9	10	VL1218	67		26	44	154
VL1824	9	10	8	8	8	VL12XX		51			
VL1840		8				VL1824	13		4	5	51
VL2440	83	74	67	68	69	VL2440				3	14
VL40XX	12	13	13	13	13	VL40XX					3
FPO	588	474	440	399	355	PMP	1279	1236	1263	1259	1261
VL0010	448	369	328	303	312	VL0010	1134	1085	1095	1086	1071
VL1012	75	54	50	43	27	VL0018		7			
VL1218	58		54	49	16	VL1012	62	71	86	92	100
VL1224		51				VL1218	61		56	54	58
VL1824	7		8	4		VL1224		50			
HOK	481	474	435	411	289	VL1824					4
VL0010	353	269	301	282	240	VL2440	22	23	26	27	28
VL0012		59				PS	207	202	200	199	131
VL1012	15	16	15	11	2	VL0010	62	57	54	60	12
VL1218	41	50	43	41	22	VL1012	34	34	35	31	20
VL1824	28	34	35	32	4	VL1218	37	37	36	35	29
VL2440	44		36	40	20	VL1224		5			
VL24XX		46				VL1824	56	52	54	53	51
VL40XX			5	5	1	VL2440	18	17	21	20	19
						Total	8707	8641	8600	8494	8401

Table 6.17.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Portugal 2008-2012

PRT	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	8707	8585	101%	8641	8556	101%	8600	8492	101%	8494	8401
TOT	8706		101%	8641		101%	8606		101%	8502	8412
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	104829	106516	98%	104751	103931	101%	103346	101483	102%	102181	101323
TOT	104829		98%	104751		101%	103346		102%	102181	101323
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	381608	383099	100%	383461	379633	101%	377625	372171	101%	374791	359294
TOT	381608		100%	383461		101%	377625		101%	374791	359294
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	369133	257050	144%	309099	223782	138%	347460	237494	146%	361014	
TOT	369136		144%	309099		138%	347274		146%	361017	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	186080	185209	100%	161944	164552	98%	189289	182940	103%	188122	
TOT	186082		100%	161944		98%	189292		103%	188060	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.17.2 and 6.17.3, suggest significant differences between the two data sources, although DCF data appears more complete in most cases. DCF national and fleet segment totals matched well for all parameters for all years analysed.

### 6.17.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Portugal in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.17.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Portugal

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>PRT</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>11403</b>		<b>437</b>	<b>788</b>	<b>11010</b>		<b>462</b>	<b>746</b>	<b>11107</b>		<b>585</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>10119</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>256</b>
Capacity	4	188			4	192			4	204			4	208		4	204
Capital	4	142		40	4	144		42	4	153		45					
Effort	12	512		40	12	484		42	12	544		45	4	362			
Employment	3			117	3			126	3			135					
Enterprises	3	81			3	83			3	94			3	92			
Expenditure	8	121		200	8	126		210	8	90		270					
Income	4	120		40	4	126		42	4	90		90	1				
Landings	748	10188			748	9804			706	9877			722	9405			1

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.17.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Portugal

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>PRT</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital				52.7				55.3				62.6					
Effort	51.0			52.7	53.0			55.3	58.0			60.9					
Employment				56.4				55.4				62.6					
Enterprises																	
Expenditure				55.2				55.3				62.6					
Income				55.2				55.3				62.6					
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- No Clustering information provided.
- Some issue on landings data were encountered; such as only partial landings weight submitted for several species (landings in weight did not correspond to landings in value)
- Forecast figures for 2011 were based on Total Landings Value instead of Total Landings income, as the latter was not provided during the data call.

## 6.18 ROMANIA

### 6.18.1 Delivery of data

All datasets, with the exception of capital value, were submitted before the data call deadline, with further upload activity, see table 6.18.1.

Table 6.18.1 Date of uploads for Romania

ROU Templates	3/6/2012	3/7/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY		2	2
CAPACITY_TOT		1	1
CAPVALINVEST			
CAPVALINVEST_TOT			
CLUSTER_DEFINITION		1	1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4		1	1
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA		1	1
EFFORT_TOT		1	1
EMPLOYMENT		1	1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT		1	1
EXPENDITURE	2	1	3
EXPENDITURE_TOT		1	1
FISHENT	1	1	2
FISHENT_TOT		1	1
INCOME	1	1	2
INCOME_TOT		1	1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	7		7
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1		1
REC_CATCH	1		1

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.18.2 Coverage

Table 6.18.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Romania. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.18.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information. In the case of Romania, insufficient clustering information was provided.

Table 6.18.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Romania: 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
INACTIVE	36	280	223	288	298
VL0006		36	14	15	23
VL0612	26	232	202	269	271
VL1218	1	1	3	3	3
VL1824	2	3	3	1	1
VL2440	7	8	1		
PG	395	153	198	187	196
VL0006	50	14	35	38	30
VL0612	345	139	163	149	166
PGO		4			
VL1218		3			
VL1824		1			
PGP				1	1
VL1824				1	1
PMP	10	1	7	11	13
VL0006			1	3	3
VL0612			6	7	8
VL1218	4				1
VL1824	2				
VL2440	4	1		1	1
TM		2	1	1	
VL2440		2	1	1	
Total	441	440	429	488	508

Table 6.18.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Romania 2008-2012.

ROU	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	441	438	101%	440	444	99%	429	475	90%	488	508
TOT	441		101%	441		99%	430		91%	488	510
Gross tonnage											
FFT	2920	1670	175%	2291	1871	122%	1000	1221	82%	1000	925
TOT	2340		140%	2302		123%	1047		86%	915	925
kW											
FFT	8747	6241	140%	8555	7174	119%	5227	6577	79%	6964	7084
TOT	8717		140%	8692		121%	5447		83%	6964	7084
Landings value											
FFT	725	659	110%	587	595	99%	485	491	99%	1422	
TOT	725		110%	587		99%	485		99%	1422	
Landings weight											
FFT	445	444	100%	289	332	87%	231	231	100%	537	
TOT	445		100%	288		87%	231		100%	537	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.18.2 and 6.18.3, suggest that some capacity and landings data were not reported. Significant differences were observed in gross tonnage and kilowatts for 2010 and landings weight for 2009. National totals equate relatively well with fleet segment totals for the parameters and years analysed.

### 6.18.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Romania in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.18.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Romania

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>ROU</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>161</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>201</b>		<b>122</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>176</b>		<b>98</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>55</b>
Capacity	4	36			4	44			4	40			4	44		4	44
Effort	11	20		30	11	24		36	11	20		26	11	28	37		
Employment	3			15	3			18	3			15	3		21		
Enterprises	3			21	3			18	3			15	3		21		
Expenditure	8			40	8			48	8			40	8		56		
Income	4	20			4	24			4	20			4	24			
Landings	26	76			44	98			40	86			46	92			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.18.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Romania

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>ROU</b>																	
Capacity		100				100				100				100			100
Effort	50	100		50	50	100		50	50	100		50	50	100	50		
Employment				50				50				50			50		
Enterprises				100				100				100			100		
Expenditure				60				60				60			60		
Income		100				100				100				100			
Landings	100	100			100	100			100	100			100	100			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Significant amounts of missing data
- Clustering information incomplete

## 6.19 SLOVENIA

### 6.19.1 Delivery of data

All datasets were submitted before the data call deadline. Following quality checking procedures by the JRC and the Slovenian national expert, some data were adjusted and datasets re-submitted during and after the AER meeting in March, see table 6.19.1.

Table 6.19.1 Date of uploads for Slovenia

SVN	3/6/2012	3/7/2012	4/16/2012	upload attempts
Templates				
CAPACITY		5		5
CAPACITY_TOT		4		4
CAPVALINVEST	1			1
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	1			1
CLUSTER_DEFINITION				
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1		1	2
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	2		2	4
EFFORT_TOT	1		1	2
EMPLOYMENT	1			1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1			1
EXPENDITURE	2		1	3
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1		1	2
FISHENT	2			2
FISHENT_TOT	1			1
INCOME	1			1
INCOME_TOT	1			1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	5			5
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1			1
REC_CATCH	3			3

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.19.2 Coverage

Table 6.19.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Slovenia. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.19.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information. No cluster information was provided by Slovenia.

Table 6.19.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Slovenia 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	56	54	57	51	52
VL0006	25	22	26	21	21
VL0612	30	32	29	30	31
VL1218	1		2		
DTS	19	18	18	16	15
VL0612	7	6	7	4	4
VL1218	12	12	11	12	11
FPO	3	4	5	2	2
VL0006	2	3	3	1	1
VL0612			1		
VL1218	1	1	1	1	1
HOK		2	2	1	1
VL0006		1	1		
VL0612		1	1	1	1
INACTIVE	93	98	94	102	103
VL0006	56	57	55	57	57
VL0612	35	38	37	42	42
VL1218	1	2	1	2	3
VL1824	1	1	1	1	1
PGP	1			4	3
VL0006				3	3
VL0612	1			1	
PMP	3	2	3	4	4
VL0006	1	1		2	2
VL0612	1	1	3	2	2
VL1218	1				
PS	4	5	4	4	4
VL0006		1			
VL0612	1				
VL1218	3	4	4	4	4
TM	2	2	2	2	2
VL2440	2	2	2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>186</b>

Table 6.19.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Slovenia 2008-2012.

SVN	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	181	181	100%	185	185	100%	185	185	100%	186	186
TOT	181		100%	185		100%	185		100%	186	186
Gross tonnage											
FFT	983	983	100%	1004	1011	99%	1004	1011	99%	1004	1004
TOT	983		100%	1004		99%	1004		99%	1004	1004
kW											
FFT	10653	10653	100%	10953	10947	100%	10956	10950	100%	10857	10857
TOT	10653		100%	10953		100%	10956		100%	10857	10857
Landings value											
FFT	2078	1398	149%	2171	1687	129%	1993	1990	100%	2537	
TOT	2078		149%	2171		129%	1993		100%	2537	
Landings weight											
FFT	686	687	100%	866	867	100%	764	764	100%	719	
TOT	686		100%	866		100%	764		100%	719	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values



The data in Tables 6.18.2 and 6.18.3, suggest that most capacity and landings data were reported; no significant differences were observed between the two data sources. Additionally, national totals equate with fleet segment totals for the parameters and years analysed.

### 6.19.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Slovenia in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.19.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Slovenia

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
SVN	208	1012			200	944			216	1294			192	931		5	80
Capacity	4	72			4	68			4	68			4	68		4	64
Capital	4	51			4	68			4	68							
Effort	1	18			1	17			12	126							
Employment	3	46			3	43			3	43							
Enterprises	3	23			3	21			3	22			3	22			
Expenditure									8	136							
Income	4	62			4	62			4	64			4	64			
Landings	188	722			180	648			176	746			180	760			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.19.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Slovenia

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
SVN																	
Capacity																	
Capital																	
Effort																	
Employment																	
Enterprises																	
Expenditure																	
Income																	
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Significant amount of expenditure parameters not submitted for most of the years requested.
- Clustering information not provided
- Economic performance indicators not estimated for 2008 and 2009 due to no cost items provided for those years.

## 6.20 SPAIN

### 6.20.1 Delivery of data

Spain submitted slightly more than half of the datasets on the deadline. There was no further uploading activity from Spain. Capacity, capital value, landings and recreational catch datasets were not submitted, see table 6.20.1. Following JRC quality and coverage checking procedures, JRC contacted the Spanish authorities and questioned both the quality and coverage of the data submitted. However, the JRC received no response from the Spanish national correspondent.

Table 6.20.1 Date of uploads for Spain

ESP Templates	3/9/2012	upload attempts
CAPACITY		
CAPACITY_TOT		
CAPVALINVEST		
CAPVALINVEST_TOT		
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	1	1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4	1	1
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA	1	1
EFFORT_TOT	1	1
EMPLOYMENT	1	1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1	1
EXPENDITURE	1	1
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1	1
FISHENT	1	1
FISHENT_TOT	1	1
INCOME	1	1
INCOME_TOT	1	1
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4		
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT		
REC_CATCH		

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.20.2 Coverage

Table 6.20.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Spain. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.20.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.20.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Spain 2008-2012

No data available

Table 6.20.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Spain 2008-2010.

ESP	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT			0%			0%			0%		
TOT		11420	0%		11119	0%		10847	0%		
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT			0%			0%			0%		
TOT		461071	0%		439594	0%		414527	0%		
<b>kW</b>											
FFT			0%			0%			0%		
TOT		1029530	0%		979667	0%		934075	0%		
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT			0%			0%			0%		
TOT		1916031	0%		1793181	0%		1869410	0%		
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT			0%			0%			0%		
TOT		891284	0%		703945	0%		755465	0%		

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

Insufficient information on which to base any conclusions.

### 6.20.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Spain in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.20.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Spain

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
ESP	17	90		644	17	101		728	19	105		816					
Effort	1			46	1			52	1			51					
Employment	3			138	3			156	3			153					
Enterprises	3	90			3	101			3	105							
Expenditure	7			322	7			364	8			408					
Income	3			138	3			156	4			204					

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.20.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Spain

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>ESP</b>																	
Effort	8.0			21.7	7.0			18.8	3.0			11.5					
Employment				21.7				18.8				11.5					
Enterprises																	
Expenditure				21.7				18.8				11.5					
Income				21.7				18.8				11.5					

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Major quality issues as significant amount of missing datasets
- Incomplete economic analysis for Spain, affecting EU overview and regional analysis.

## 6.21 SWEDEN

### 6.21.1 Delivery of data

Most datasets were submitted on the data call deadline. Following quality checks by JRC and the Swedish expert, some datasets were changed and resubmitted before, during and after both of the AER meetings, see table 6.20.1.

Table 6.20.1 Date of uploads for Sweden

SWE	3/9/2012	3/10/2012	3/28/2012	3/29/2012	4/5/2012	4/12/2012	6/1/2012	upload attempts
Templates								
CAPACITY	7							7
CAPACITY_TOT	1							1
CAPVALINVEST	3			1				4
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	2			1				3
CLUSTER_DEFINITION		3		1				4
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4		4	1	3		1		9
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA		4	1	3		1		9
EFFORT_TOT		1	1	2		1		5
EMPLOYMENT	1			1				2
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1			1				2
EXPENDITURE	3			1			2	6
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1			1			2	4
FISHENT	3				3			6
FISHENT_TOT	1				1			2
INCOME	6		1	1				8
INCOME_TOT	1		1	1				3
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4	7	3	8					18
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT	1	3	2					6
REC_CATCH	2							2

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.21.2 Coverage

Table 6.20.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for Sweden. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.20.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.21.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for Sweden 2008-2011.

	2008	2009	2010	2011		2008	2009	2010	2011
DFN	447	337	14	13	MGP			2	1
VL0010	322	216			VL2440			1	
VL1012	105	106			VL40XX			1	1
VL1218	19	15	14	13	PG			766	751
VL2440	1				VL0010			625	610
DRB		2	4	1	VL1012			141	141
VL0010		2	3	1	PGP	5	10		
VL1012			1		VL0010	4	7		
DTS	254	248	235	223	VL1012	1	3		
VL0010	12	6	17	21	PMP	4	3	1	7
VL1012	50	53	49	48	VL0010	3	1		5
VL1218	107	100	89	80	VL1012		2	1	2
VL1824	53	58	49	43	VL1824	1			
VL2440	32	31	31	31	PS		4	5	6
FPO	331	438	3	4	VL0010		1	1	2
VL0010	299	407			VL1012		1	1	1
VL1012	29	28			VL1218		2	3	2
VL1218	3	3	3	4	VL2440				1
HOK	67	44	3	5	TM	37	29	22	17
VL0010	44	23			VL0010	1			
VL1012	19	17			VL1218	3			
VL1218	2	3	3	4	VL1824	3	1		1
VL1824	1	1		1	VL2440	19	15	11	9
VL2440	1				VL40XX	11	13	11	7
INACTIVE	364	356	362	331	Total	1509	1471	1417	1359
VL0010	298	297	286	284					
VL1012	38	28	40	33					
VL1218	7	9	12	4					
VL1824	4	4	8	3					
VL2440	16	18	16	7					
VL40XX	1								

Table 6.21.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for Sweden 2008-2012.

SWE	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
Number of Vessels											
FFT	1509	1486	102%	1471	1418	104%	1417	1369	104%	1359	1365
TOT	1509		102%	1471		104%	1417		104%	1359	
Gross tonnage											
FFT	43247	41807	103%	41709	38600	108%	38632	33020	117%	32944	29490
TOT	43247		103%	41709		108%	38632		117%	32944	
kW											
FFT	212446	208913	102%	207847	196619	106%	196574	179031	110%	178166	169492
TOT	212446		102%	207847		106%	196574		110%	178166	
Landings value											
FFT	119875	104527	115%	106171	90314	118%	103301	99949	103%	116356	116356
TOT	119875		115%	106171		118%	103301		103%	116356	
Landings weight											
FFT	214067	226982	94%	199366	216591	92%	204457	220923	93%	172697	172697
TOT	214067		94%	199366		92%	204457		93%	172697	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

The data in Tables 6.21.2 and 6.21.3, suggest that most capacity and landings data were reported; no significant differences were observed between the two data sources. Additionally, national totals equate with fleet segment totals for the parameters and years analysed.

### 6.21.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by Sweden in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.21.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by Sweden

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>SWE</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>2886</b>		<b>122</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>2943</b>		<b>123</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>2832</b>		<b>123</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>2704</b>		<b>5</b>	
Capacity	4	128			4	124			4	100			4	108		4	
Capital	4	20		28	4	9		37	4	9		37					
Effort	12	662		10	12	721		9	11	710		9	10	688			
Employment	3			30	3			27	3			27					
Enterprises	3	31			3	30			3	34			3	37			
Expenditure	7	20		54	7	18		50	8	18		50					
Income	4	40			4	36			4	27							
Landings	144	1927			134	1948			158	1882			148	1822			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.21.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by Sweden

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>SWE</b>																	
Capacity		100				100				100				100			
Capital		76.7		26.4		63.7		39.5		68.4		48.8					
Effort	89.3	100		24.0	91.1	100		54.5	91.6	100		58.4	100	100			
Employment				37.1				52.7				67.5					
Enterprises		100				100				100				100			
Expenditure		76.7		30.9		63.7		49.0		67.9		59.7					
Income		93.4				81.8				89.3							
Landings		100				100				100				100			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Although Sweden has extensively used the guidelines on clustering, some issues on the clustering approach remain.



## 6.22 UNITED KINGDOM

### 6.22.1 Delivery of data

Around half of the UK datasets were submitted on the data call deadline. Following quality checking procedures by the JRC and the UK national expert, most of the remaining datasets were uploaded during the AER meeting in March. Some data were adjusted and income datasets re-submitted during the second AER meeting in June. Recreational catch data was not submitted, see table 6.22.1.

Table 6.22.1 Date of uploads for the UK

GBR Templates	3/9/2012	3/28/2012	3/30/2012	6/6/2012	upload attempt
CAPACITY			1		1
CAPACITY_TOT			1		1
CAPVALINVEST	2	1			3
CAPVALINVEST_TOT	2	1			3
CLUSTER_DEFINITION	1				1
EFFORT_FAO_LEVEL3_4			3		3
EFFORT_FS_SUPRA			3		3
EFFORT_TOT			1		1
EMPLOYMENT	1				1
EMPLOYMENT_TOT	1				1
EXPENDITURE	1				1
EXPENDITURE_TOT	1				1
FISHENT			1		1
FISHENT_TOT			1		1
INCOME	1		1	1	3
INCOME_TOT	1		1	1	3
LANDINGS_FAO_LEVEL3_4			2		2
LANDINGS_FAO_TOT			2		2
REC_CATCH					

Numbers in cells refer to the number of upload attempts; colours: green refers to upload activity before deadline, red after deadline.

### 6.22.2 Coverage

Table 6.22.2 identifies the fleet segments reported in the capacity upload sheets for the UK. These segments should equate with the segments reported in the national programmes. When evaluating coverage with respect to the data call, for each fleet segment in table 6.22.2 we checked that all the requested parameters were either present or absent. It is not always possible to confirm outstanding parameters due to missing or incomplete clustering information.

Table 6.22.2 Number of vessels per fleet segment for the UK 2008-2012

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012		2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
DFN	696	697	683	672	711	INACTIVE	1706	1742	1734	1734	1827
VL0010	652	657	640	627	668	VL0010	1535	1560	1568	1566	1650
VL1012	14	14	16	19	16	VL1012	56	59	54	56	64
VL1218	17	15	13	13	14	VL1218	64	68	70	70	71
VL1824	5	3	5	4	3	VL1824	16	19	18	18	18
VL2440	8	8	9	9	10	VL2440	30	30	21	21	20
DRB	239	249	242	239	274	VL40XX	5	6	3	3	4
VL0010	119	116	95	92	117	MGP	14	15	16	16	16
VL1012	22	26	26	28	28	VL0010	9	8	9	8	10
VL1218	56	62	70	69	82	VL1012	4	4	2	3	3
VL1824	21	20	24	23	20	VL1218	1	3	5	5	3
VL2440	20	24	26	26	26	PGP	84	86	64	63	80
VL40XX	1	1	1	1	1	VL0010	84	85	64	63	79
DTS	1075	1039	944	930	886	VL1012		1			1
VL0010	337	334	272	259	271	PMP	6	6	15	15	8
VL1012	107	97	92	100	97	VL0010	5	6	14	14	6
VL1218	287	270	250	246	228	VL1012			1	1	2
VL1824	222	221	215	210	180	VL1218	1				
VL2440	108	106	103	103	98	PS	36	40	46	44	39
VL40XX	14	11	12	12	12	VL0010	3	4	5	5	3
FPO	2209	2057	2021	2007	2012	VL1218	3	5	7	7	4
VL0010	1935	1791	1756	1737	1739	VL1824					1
VL1012	182	181	180	189	189	VL40XX	30	31	34	32	31
VL1218	76	72	72	68	72	TBB	139	125	114	114	87
VL1824	11	10	10	10	10	VL0010	32	29	23	22	10
VL2440	5	3	3	3	2	VL1012	16	15	14	15	9
HOK	396	505	529	525	517	VL1218	27	30	28	28	17
VL0010	361	473	497	494	485	VL1824	16	17	15	15	19
VL1012	13	11	12	12	14	VL2440	39	27	27	27	25
VL1218	3	2	4	4	4	VL40XX	9	7	7	7	7
VL1824		2	1	1	1	TM	1		1	1	
VL2440	17	15	13	12	11	VL1824			1	1	
VL40XX	2	2	2	2	2	VL40XX	1				
						Total	6601	6561	6409	6360	6457

The data in Tables 6.22.2 and 6.22.3, suggest no significant differences between the two datasets and that most data were reported. Additionally, national totals equate with fleet segment totals for the parameters and years analysed.

Table 6.22.3 DCF data versus Eurostat data by fleet and national totals for the UK 2008-2012

GBR	2008	Eurostat	% Dif.	2009	Eurostat	% Dif.	2010	Eurostat	% Dif.	2011	2012
<b>Number of Vessels</b>											
FFT	6601	6555	101%	6561	6491	101%	6409	6422	100%	6360	6457
TOT	6601		101%	6561		101%	6409		100%	6360	13.97
<b>Gross tonnage</b>											
FFT	223392	206000	108%	216185	208204	104%	217302	207608	105%	208399	202389
TOT	223392		108%	216185		104%	217302		105%	208399	39
<b>kW</b>											
FFT	875162	832794	105%	852034	833788	102%	843209	824843	102%	823545	810961
TOT	875162		105%	852034		102%	843209		102%	823545	128
<b>Landings value</b>											
FFT	792157	740051	107%	754407	659744	114%	832131	719237	116%	946129	
TOT	792157		107%	754404		114%	832044		116%	946129	
<b>Landings weight</b>											
FFT	575040	464174	124%	576571	431675	134%	601328	464453	129%	589783	
TOT	575040		124%	576570		134%	601295		129%	589783	

DCF submitted data as a percentage of Eurostat values

### 6.22.3 Quality

The following tables summarise, according to the available information, the sampling programme and the average sampling rate by data template achieved by UK in the 2012 DCF fleet economic data call.

Table 6.22.4 Sampling strategy by main data template submitted by the UK

N	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>GBR</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>16125</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>16489</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>16121</b>	<b>563</b>		<b>355</b>	<b>16103</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>255</b>
Capacity	4	196			4	196			4	200			4	200		4	204
Capital	4		128		4		128		4		128						
Effort	7	1399	29	42	7	1367	29	40	6	1408	29		5	1370			
Employment	3		87		3		87		3		87						
Enterprises	3	80			3	78			3	80			3	83			
Expenditure	8		232		8		232		8		232						
Income	4	29	87		4	29	87		4	29	87						
Landings	358	14372			356	14770			350	14354			342	14400			

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Table 6.22.5 Average sampling rate by sampling strategy and data template submitted by the UK

%	2008				2009				2010				2011			2012	
	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	NSS	PSS	TOT	C	PSS	TOT	C
<b>GBR</b>																	
Capacity																	
Capital			11.2				16.7				11.2						
Effort			9.1	10.6			18.6	13.7									
Employment			8.3				20.4				25.7						
Enterprises																	
Expenditure			17.6				14.5				14.2						
Income		100	15.3			100	14.2			100	13.8						
Landings																	

TOT – sampling rate for national totals (sampling survey not identified); C – census; NSS – non-probability sampling survey; PSS – probability sampling survey; blank cells may refer to either NA, NR or no information provided

Other quality issues:

- Quite significant amounts of missing data

## **7. APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A.

### Appendix A. Country Data Validity Reports

Country Data Validity Report for Member States produced by experts during the EWG 12-03 (4-8 March 2012, Ispra).

The following reports relate to the status of the uploaded data at 23 March 2012, and cover the data check results performed by JRC prior to EWG 12-03. An accompanying excel data sheet with the data as well as all inconsistencies uncovered during the data checking procedure were made available to the experts during EWG 12-03.

# Country report on data validity: BEL

---

## National total

Time consistency of the data:

Totseadays and totfishdays in 2009;

Totenercost and totenercons in 2009.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables. List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Totdirsub (DFN, DRB,DTS-2008)

Tototherinc (DFN, DRB, DTS-2008)

All variables for dcf\_Capvalue (DFN,DRB,DTS-2008)

All variables for dcf\_expenditure(DRB-2008)

Totnets (DFN-2008, 2009)

Ingnets (DFN-2008, 2009)

Totenercons(DFN-2008, DRB-2008,DTS -2008, DTS VL1824 – 2009, DFN VL1012 - 2010)

Missing variables for DTS-VL1012 (2008 )in dcf\_fishent

Missing variables for DFN VL 1012 (2010) in dcf\_employment and dcf\_expenditure.

For all requested years, data on capital value in inactive vessels are missing.

## General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

In 2008 in dcf\_expenditure only have data from DTS VL1024.

In 2009 in the dcf\_landings, dcf\_income, dcf\_expenditure, in variable enercons from dcf\_effort and in dcf\_Capvalue, only have data from DFN VL1024.

In 2010 in variable enercons from dcf\_effort, dcf\_expenditure only have data from DFN VL1224.

In 2010 in dcf\_income and dcf\_landings only have data from DFN VL1024.

In 2009 and 2010 in dcf\_capvalue, dcf\_expenditure , dcf\_income, dcf\_landings, in variable enercons from dcf\_effort only have data from DRB VL1840.

In 2009 and 2010 in dcf\_capvalue data for DTS VL1024 , DTS VL1824 and from DTS VL2440.

In 2010, only in dcf\_fishent and in dcf\_effort data for DTS VL1012 except in variable enercons. In variable enercons only have data from DTSVL 1024 and DTSVL 2440.

In 2010, in dcf\_Capval the gear DFN only data in segment VL1024 in variable totdeprep .

In 2011, in dcf\_landings only data for DTS VL1024 and DTS VL2440.

In 2011, in dcf\_income and dcf\_landings only data for DRB VL1840.

In 2011, in dcf\_landings only data for DFN VL1224.

# Country report on data validity: BGR

---

## General comments

The data for Economic, transversal, technical and biological variables, was provided via two sources. The first source is Logbooks, Sales notes and FVR, all of these data are based in the NAFA information system. The second source of information (economic variables) collected in the questionnaires by NAFA staff under the national data collection programme. The data from our information system is available for the staff responsible for the economic and transversal variables. The questionnaires are collected and processed also from NAFA staff based in Dobrich, Varna and Burgas. Biological variables are obtained based on surveys at sea.

## Consistency with other sources:

Over the next few weeks I will check why the data sent to Eurostat and the data on DCF program for active vessels vary and then sent a response.

-Errors identified in the summation of Capacity national totals. The errors have been corrected and the file will be uploaded again.

Landing values don't match income data because landings are applied only for commercially important fish species such as SPR, TUR, WHG, ANE, DGS, HMM and RPN. In practice, there are catches of other species, which recorded as incomes in the questionnaires such as revenues. In addition, some vessels are used as seasonal transportation of people and revenues also are included them in the questionnaires.

## Missing variables:

Capacity:

Errors identified in the summation for segments of Capacity totals in file dcf\_capacity. The errors have been corrected and the file will be uploaded again. Data for 2011 were repeated for 2012 since we run in 2012 with the said capacity.

Economic variables:

Financial position – the data for 2008 and 2009 is filled. The file dcf\_CapVal will be uploaded again.

Other income and direct subsidies table are filled. The file dcf\_Income will be uploaded again.

Transversal

Number of hooks were attached for 2008-2010. The file dcf\_Effort will be uploaded again.

## Time consistency of the data

For all vessels registered in the vessel register in Bulgaria only about 35% are active throughout the year. For example, there are cases where a vessel which was active in 2008 same vessel in 2009 was not active and in 2010 is again active. For this reason, I think average vessel age (totals) and average vessel length (totals) are different for different years. I think it is better when using product-based approach, not as far on a fishing vessel. Base to be a fish species.



All the data is from our statistical system, which we will check again later.

In year investments – the values was checked and it is true for 2009.

Vessel replacement value. In cells “totDepHist” was filled “totDepRep”. Repair was carried out in these cells. In 2010 it was estimated the current price per vessel segment. Results are referred in the table below

Price per tonne of active vessels for 2010

№	Length	Average on active vessels, t	Total,t	Total, levs	value/tons levs.	value/tons euro.
1	от 0 до 6 м.	2,09	673	1411538	2097,3819	1072,3743
2	от 6 до 12 м.	8,19	4635	10984315	2369,8631	1211,6918
3	от 12 до 18 м.	34,32	1373	5199887	3787,2448	1936,3875
4	от 18 до 24 м.	60,07	961	2692923,1	2802,2092	1432,7468
5	от 24 до ++	24,8	600	11966625	19944,375	10197,397

kW fishing days and GT fishing days were adjusted.

Employment

Different fishing technique reported for different years for VL0006 and VL0612 (clustering issue?). So because different vessels were active in the years 2008, 2009, and 2010. Various techniques have been used over the years.

Expenditure

This is so because different vessels were active in the years 2008, 2009, and 2010.

Fishent

In fact very few fishermen are enterprises. Most are individual persons which do not submit balance sheets. For this reason we are greatly hampered to the collection of economic variables. I know that it is better when economic variables collected by balance sheets for enterprises, but in our case they are not enterprises. Thus we are forced to collect economic variables with questionnaires.

The new Fisheries Law provides all fishermen to become enterprises.

PMP is most used technique.

# Country report on data validity: DNK

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources

In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity

Landings

Economic data

## Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Missing variables/indicators	Missing Years	explanation
Depreciation historical	2008 to 2010	Non calculated or "0" ?
Income rights	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of pots and traps	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of fishing operations	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of nets	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Length of nets	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of hooks	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Soaking time	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Total weight of catches per species	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?

## Time consistency of the data

Over the years, variables and indicators have been consistent. However, Economic Profits/Losses with or without subsidies are bad except for 2010. An increase of income landings (+60 million euros) and the decrease of most of the costs could explain this trend.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables. List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

DRB 1012, DTS0010, DTS1012, PGP0010, PGP1012, PGP1824, PMP 0010, PMP1012, all data missing (except for no. of trips). Missing segments for these variables are probably clustered. Totharmfte sometimes greater than totjob – seems to be not logical.

Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

Missing variables/indicators	Missing Years	explanation
Depreciation historical	2008 to 2010	Non calculated or " 0 " ?
Income rights	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of pots and traps	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of fishing operations	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of nets	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Length of nets	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Number of hooks	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Soaking time	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?
Total weight of catches per species	2008 to 2010	Is it a blank or a "0" ?

Time consistency of the data

Looks ok

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals.

General comments

# Country report on data validity: EST

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources. In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

There are some differences compared to the Eurostat data. Discrepancies are related with capacity (GT, kW, number) and landings (volume, value) totals. The value of landings totals may differ between 20-30%. The reason of this remains unclear but the DCF data match the official data from Estonian Fisheries System.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity

Landings

Economic data

There are no important differences between national totals and fleet values.

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Average age of the vessels was missing for 2011. It was caused because instead of 2011 wrong year was marked. There were two average age values for 2012 in the database. Corrected.

FTE national and harmonized totals are missing for 2008 and 2009 because the data were not available for coastal fisheries segments (VL0010 and VL1012).

Days at Sea and Fishing Days are missing as the data were not available for coastal fisheries segments (PG VL0010 and PG VL1012).

Time consistency of the data

Time consistency of the data is rather good.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Days at Sea and Fishing Days are missing for coastal fisheries segments (PG VL0010 and PG VL1012) in 2008, 2009, 2010. These data were not available.

FTE national and harmonized values are missing for coastal fisheries segments (PG VL0010 and PG VL1012) in 2008 and 2009. These data were not available.

Number of Soaking time was missing. Data were not available.

Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

Time consistency of the data

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

Time consistency of the data is rather good.

## General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

General state of the data quality and validity is good. There were some errors in the data that needed improvement and re-uploading.

Due to confidentiality requirement only capacity data for deep-sea fleet (DTS VL40XX) have been reported. Only two companies operating with 5 vessels in this segment.

# Country report on data validity: FIN

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources

In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

– there is differences, but they probably could be explained by the fact that Eurostat's (EC No 1921/2006) and DCF's definitions for landings are quite different

dcf: live weight; all national landings anywhere;

Eurostat: product weight; all landings to country in question by all community +EFTA vessels, no landings to foreign ports

would probably be better to compare landings of dcf with nominal catch of Eurostat

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity -OK

Landings. – some differences could be found

Economic data -OK

Missing variables / indicators -no

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Time consistency of the data -OK

## Fleet segments

Missing variables - no

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Missing indicators -no

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

Time consistency of the data -ok

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat. -ok

General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

Depth costs in the uploaded data is relatively very high – the PIM-calculation to be checked

# Country report on data validity: FRA

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources

There are some data missing : regional fields are not complete.

In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity

Landings

Economic data

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Missing variables/indicators	Missing Years	explanation
Financial position	2008 to 2010	No data available in time could be implemented
Annual depreciation	2009	
Depreciation historical	2008 to 2010	Non calculated
Depreciation replacement	2009	Misunderstanding at workshop in Naples, can be implemented
Fishing days	2008 -2009	Changes in data collection
Gt per fishing days	2008	Changes in data collection
Kw per fishing days	2008	Changes in data collection
Fishing rights	2008 to 2010	None in France
Income rights	2008 to 2010	None in France
Days at sea	2008-2009	Methodologies changes (SACROIS)
Trips	2008-2009	Methodologies changes (SACROIS)
Unpaid labour	2008 to 2010	No estimated
Value of landings	2008-2009	Methodologies changes and incomplete year
Live weight of landings	2008-2009	Methodologies changes and incomplete year
Opportunity cost of capital	2009	Could be a blank instead of "0"
Economic profit/ns and ys	2009	Impossible to calculate (see opportunity cost)
ROFTA	2009	Impossible to calculate (see opportunity cost)

## Time consistency of the data

Templates	variables	Comments
Capacity		Only active vessels
Fishent		File was not detailed in 2008
Expenditure	depcost	no consistency in 2009 it s right for 2010, new methodology 2008 very close to 2010
	Income	2008 : some data missing samples estimation (extrapolation) consistency 2009-2010
	totdirsub	samples estimation (extrapolation) consistency 2009-2010
	tototherinc	samples estimation (extrapolation) consistency 2009-2010
Capvalinvest	FinPos	no data available in time for the fleets. Variable to work on.
	dephist :	no data available in time
	deprep :	no data for 2009 (definition problem) consistency in 2010 proved by two methodologies
Rec_Catches		this is the beginning of data collection and it is very difficult to obtain exhaustive data
Landings		2009 : incomplete data the total is good in 2010 Pay attention "MZZ" fao code has to be understood as "other species" .
effort	trips	2008 – 2009 : incomplete data
	enercons	2008 : no full coverage
	fishdays	2008-2009 : no full coverage

## Fleet segments

Tables uploaded have some errors noticed in "checks from DB"

- landings/income: there are two sources for these data (information system and extrapolation) and the comparison would be not consistent when we compare average data.

- capacity: numbers of vessels, KW and GT, average age : eurostat (inactive vessels included from activity segmentation )

- comparison between number of vessels and employment: Table of capacity comes from census file while employment is an extrapolation from surveys. Furthermore, capacity table is not clustered while employment table is.

- These explanations can be applied for expenditure and income issues compare to number of vessels.

- age : in French fleet, it is not unusual to find very old vessels.

- effort table: data from this table are uploaded from a a new information base (SACROIS), and it could be irrelevant to compare these data to another source.

## Time consistency of the data

### - Area 37

In this region, segments are clustered and there is no sample in other segments. It is possible to analyse two segments DTS 1824 and PS 40XX without any problems.

### - Area OFR

For two segments, PS40XX (census) and DTS 1824 (almost 70% of the segment), tables could be used for the analysis.

### - Area 27

region	variables	Segment	Comments/problems
Area 27	investments	All	Discrepancies/ 2 samples in 2008 and different methodology since 2009
	Landings	HOK >12m	the sample is too low to have consistency
		blanks	when samples are very small
	crew cost	MGO >10 :	problematic
	income	HOK 2440	very bad for income
	Repair costs	HOK 1218	small samples
		HOK 2440	small samples
		TM 40XX	less vessels in 2010 /3 vessels and one with incomplete activities
		MGO 1012	only 2010 good
		MGP 010	no real explanation for discrepancies
		PS	2009-2010 : different clusters
	non variable costs	TBB 1218	Cluster with DTS 1218
	variables costs	TBB 1218	Cluster with DTS 1218
		DTS 1218	Cluster with DTS 1218
	Employement		Good except for clusters
	Enterprises	all	calculation methodology changes between 2008 and 2009
	Capvalinvest	all	deprep 2008 and 2010 2009 was unclear in the definition, France had waited for workshop on capital . Could be done later.
	Reccatch	all	
	effort	DTS 2440	cluster en 2009
		TM 1012	-

## General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.



Capacity table will be uploaded next week: variables Tot Gt and tot KW needs to be checked and corrected if necessary (average in previous year, and total in 2010). Employment table was already uploaded during the meeting.

France is working on data collection by improving depreciation historical and depreciation replacement calculation.

# Country report on data validity: DEU

---

## National total

### Capacity

The capacity data seem to refer to different dates: submitted data relate pretty well to Eurostat data from the previous year.

Totkw TM40XX: the Eurostat segmentation is not necessarily consistent with DCF segmentation, as DCF gear is determined annually based upon logbook entries. Most likely Eurostat segmentation refers to the main gear as reported in the fleet register. This does not necessarily have to be the predominant gear in the year of reference.

### Landings

Value and volume of landings from Eurostat are too low, even though the German DCF data exclude the pelagic fleet. This applies to several other countries as well, therefore it is most likely that the Eurostat data provided for the check are not appropriate.

### Economic data

Total jobs: several vessels report very low turnover, therefore the owners' activity is not accounted for as employment. Many small scale fishermen even regard themselves as sideline or hobby fishermen.

Seadays < fishdays: according to the effort definition, fishing days can be more than days at sea.

Sea days per vessel > 365: There is an inconsistency in the calculation: capacity data are unclustered, but effort data are clustered. E.g. sea days per clustered segment are divided by the number of vessels of an unclustered segment, which is, of course, too low.

Totlandinc > tovallandg: for Totlandinc, there is an estimated value of landings which were not sold (mostly own consumption).

## Fleet segments

### Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Number of fishing operations applies only to purse seiners. There are none in the German fleet.

### Missing indicators

### Time consistency of the data

Some leaps between years for less important segments with small number of vessels

### General comments

# Country report on data validity: IRE

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources. In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

It was found that data of volume and value of landings does not match the information from Eurostat, the reasons could be explained by the different methodology and definitions describing landings between DCF and Eurostat.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Economic data

National totals match the data by fleet segment

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Some transversal variables are missing for 2008 – 2011 period, such as Number of fishing operations, Number of pots and traps, Number of nets, Length of nets, Number of hooks, Soaking time.

Time consistency of the data

The consistency of data is basically ok. Despite the fact that the volume of landings during 2008-2010 period increased by 58%, whereas days at sea, fishing days and fleet capacity remained stable.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables

There are number of missing values of Employment in some segments, (country reports that no data is available)

The volume of landing is presented in wrong weight magnitude (should be in KG), according to data from DB, all landings in 2010 consisted of 310 KG. There are also missing some variables for value of landings.

Data in Effort\_fao, Employment and Income of some fleet segments have no vessels in Capacity. There are two options, missing data in capacity or different different segmentation of the same fleet.

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Time consistency of the data

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

Data consistency in time is basically ok.

## General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

Data quality is rather good. Data missing issues and explanations of reasons as well as above mentioned examples about significant increase in landings when capacity and effort were stable needs to be explained by National expert.

# Country report on data validity: ITA

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources

In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

Following the template for quality checking provided by JRC, some discrepancies between data collected by DCF and those from Eurostat have been highlighted. The analysis was carried out over a period of three years, from 2008 to 2010. Two categories of data have been compared, data on capacity in terms of vessels number, gross tonnage and engine power, and data on total landings in volume and value.

Regarding the Italian fleet capacity, data provided by DCF shows an higher number of vessels than data reported by Eurostat. A difference of around 9% has been registered for each year of the period under analysis. This difference is around 2% if calculated in terms of GT and around 10% in terms of kW. This is probably due to the different estimation approaches for the fleet. Eurostat data are related to the fleet in a specific point in time, while DCF data are related to an average fleet estimated during the reference year. On the contrary, in 2008 and 2009 data, landings in weight and value are very similar and differences can be associated to a different level of approximation. However, a more significant difference is registered in 2010, when landings reported by Eurostat are higher than those reported in DCF.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

### Capacity

National totals related to capacity match with data on capacity provided by fleet segment. This check has been done by summing data by fleet segments and comparing the result with data provided at country level.

### Landings

National totals related to landings data match with data on landings provided by fleet segment. This check has been done by summing data by fleet segments and comparing the result with data provided at country level.

### Economic data

National totals related to economic data match with the same data provided by fleet segment. This check has been done by summing data by fleet segments and comparing the result with data provided at country level.

### Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Some missing variables have been detected in the Italian data. In particular, other income and income from rights are not reported. Other income are not reported as values are negligible for the Italian fleets. Income from rights is not available as tradable fishing rights systems are not in

force for Italian fisheries. As a consequence, it is not possible to sell fishing rights and generate income from that. For the same reason, the value of fishing rights is not reported.

Other not reported variables are the number of fishing operations, the soaking time, the in-year investment and the number of nets. As for the number of fishing operations, Italy asked for derogation in the NP 2011-2013 as already done in the NP 2009-2010 as information on this variable, which does not affect nor production or operating costs, is not required by logbooks and not easy to be collected by questionnaires. Italy asked for derogation also regarding the soaking time in the NP 2009-2010. As for the number of nets, Appendix VIII of the EU Decision 93/2010 leaves to MSs the possibility to provide nets length as an alternative to number of nets. Data on the nets length has been provided.

The variable Right cost has been reported for years 2008 and 2009, but not reported for 2010. The analysis at fleet segment level highlighted that fishing rights costs are related only to those DTS VL40XX fishing in Other fishing regions, which are represented for Italy by area FAO 34 (East Atlantic). No cost items have been provided for this Italian oceanic fleet for 2010, being landings and effort data only provisional.

Even though some variables are missing as described above, all indicators suggested by JRC for analysis can be estimated. The variables needed for the estimation of these indicators are available. As a consequence, no indicator is missing.

#### Time consistency of the data

The consistency of data along time has been checked considering only value increased by more than 100%. This analysis has highlighted the presence of significant changes in two variables: total nets length and total traps and pots. Total nets length changed significantly in 2010 comparing with the previous two years from around 460 million to around 1700 million in metres. Total traps and pots showed a significant change in 2010 compared with the previous two years from around 5 million to around 26 million in number.

#### Fleet segments

Missing variables. List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

The analysis at fleet segment level have shown that a perfect match exists between data collected by national totals and data collected by fleet segment. This means that missing variables at fleet segment level are exactly the same variables not available at country level.

#### Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

As reported above for totals national, no indicator is missing at fleet segment level. All the indicators suggested for the analysis are available at fleet segment level.

#### Time consistency of the data

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

As reported above for the data at country level, the only variables showing significant variations in the period under analysis are the length of nets and the total traps and pots.

## **General comments**

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

Data provided are almost complete. All the indicators proposed for analysis can be estimated by using the available data.

The only inconsistency is related to the fleet segment TBB VL2440, where the average length over all is lower than 24 metres. This is due to the aggregation of all TBB vessels in the LOA class 24-40 for the fleet registered in some Adriatic regions (e.g. Marche). This aggregation is justified by the small number of vessels with a LOA less than 24 metres in those regions. The cluster of vessels at regional level has determined an average LOA lower than 24 metres at national level for the segment TBB VL2440.

# Country report on data validity: LVA

## **National total**

Does national totals match the information from other sources

No

In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity

There is some difference between average age in total and this one by segments because PGP segment was excluded from calculation of average age.

There is some difference between average length in total and this one by segments because PGP segment was excluded from calculation of average age.

Landings

Economic data

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Historical depreciation data were not provided for 2008 -2010

Investment data were not provided for 2008

Financial position was not calculated, because Debt data were not received.

Time consistency of the data

The data are consistent

## **Fleet segments**

Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Historical depreciation data were not provided for 2008 -2010

Investment data were not provided for 2008

Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

Financial position was not calculated, because Debt data were not received.

Time consistency of the data

The data are consistent

## **General comments**

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

Economic data cover all members of the population. Despite economic data collection is based on questionnaire form, participation of the responders is obligatory according to the Latvian legislation. All the economic data are stored in the CSB database. Thus Type of data collection for Latvian fishing fleet is "Census". The data Achieved sample rate and Response rate were 100 %.

For the calculation of FTE indicators "Study No FISH/2005/14 Calculation of labour" was used

In case of unpaid labour calculation the data about average salary in the segment and number of unemployed person were used. These data were received by questionnaires.

The price data delivered from questionnaires and sale notes were analysed and the most adequate prices were used.

Economic data collected for distant-sea vessels more than 40 m were not presented to preserve the confidentiality of data.

Formulas from Regulation (EC) No 1198/2006 on the European Fisheries Fund; COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 498/2007 were used for Capital value calculation. The same Formulas were used which applied for calculation of the vessel scrapping compensation in the frame of Operational Programme of fleet reduction. (It was possible to use the formulas because for the last 15 years only three new vessels more than 10 metres were included into Fleet Register.)



# Country report on data validity: LTU

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources  
In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

Data of landings in DCF does not match the Eurostat data. From the values of Eurostat data it is clear that they are incomplete compare to DCF. The problem could be a different definition of variables regarding value and volume of landings as well as different request concerning only selected species or ports.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments  
Capacity  
Landings  
Economic data

National totals match the data by fleet segment, only some irrelevant discrepancies were observed in value and volume of landings.

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Missing variables of national totals: Financial position in 2008, Investments in 2008, Unpaid labour in 2008 (no data were reported at national totals level)

Time consistency of the data

Time consistency of data is fairly good

## Fleet segments

Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

In the data concerning fleet capacity, effort and landings, was found a different codification of same clustered segments, by naming them in different codes (without focusing on NP), thus after harmonization of gear code errors in the name of clustered segments issue of data incompatibility will be solved.

There are some missing variables for capacity and fishing enterprises in the segment INACTIVE VL1824 in 2008 and 2009 (the segment does not exist in NP).

Value of landings in high sea fishing vessels during 2010 was presented significantly lower compare to 2009 and 2011, whereas income from landings from enterprises which operates in high seas is much higher and is in reasonable level.

According to the data the price of Cunene horse mackerel during the year of 2010 and 2011 jumped from 0.25 EUR/kg to 0.7 EUR/kg. These figures must be checked if they are correct and reloaded if necessary.

Time consistency of the data

Time consistency of data is fairly good

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

**General comments**

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

The quality and consistency of data are fairly good. The segmentation of transversal data as efforts, capacity and landings must be prepared according to requirements in National program, otherwise transversal and economic data are incompatible.

The low value of landings in long distance fisheries and high price change in Cunene horse mackerel during 2010-2011 must be explained

# Country report on data validity: MLT

---

## National total

### •Does national totals match the information from other sources

**In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.**

There exist discrepancies with Eurostat data for the following variables;

-Two major discrepancies (over 40%) exist for the variable total GT for the years 2008 and 2009.

-Minor discrepancies (less than 12%) exist in relation to the following variables; total GT for 2010, total KW for 2008 and 2009, total number of vessels for 2008 and 2010, total value of landings for 2008-2010 and total volume of landings for 2008-2010. No discrepancies exist in relation to total KW for 2010 and total number of vessels for 2009.

### •Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

✓Capacity

✓Landings

✓Economic data

The consistency between the national totals and the total of the fleet segments is present for all variables and no discrepancies exist except for the year 2008 for the variable VarCost (variable costs). There is a minor error in the national total. The error is due to a wrong addition of values at fleet segment level.

### •Missing variables / indicators

**List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.**

The following variables are missing;

-Length of nets (IngNets), Hooks (tothooks), Nets (totNets), Soaking time (totsoaktime), Traps,pots (Tottraps) are missing for the year 2008 and 2009. This is because data is not available for all the segments.

-Value of fishing rights, income from fishing rights and fishing rights cost is missing for the year 2008 because of no data for all the segments. Data in this regard was collected for the first time for the year 2009. This is partly due to the fact that total allowable catch (TAC) for bluefin tuna was introduced in 2009.

### •Time consistency of the data

An increase in the value of annual depreciation, depreciated historical and replacement value has been noted for the year 2010. This is due to a change in the methodology. The Perpetual Inventory Method (PIM) has been used as from the year 2010.

In addition, the harmonised full-time equivalent has also increased during the year 2010. This is mainly due to an improvement in the internal data checking procedures at the Member state level. An increase in the total value of un-paid labour has also been noted for the year 2009 when compared to the year 2008. This is also mainly due to an improvement in the internal data checking procedures at the Member state level.

On the other hand a decrease has been noted with regards to direct subsidies for the year 2009.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

The following variables are missing at fleet segment level;

-Nets (totNets) is available for the year 2010 and 2011 at National total level only

Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

Time consistency of the data

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

### **General comments**

**The JRC data system flagged out the following issues;**

**-Number of vessels > total jobs (for the years 2008-2010):** In the case of Malta this is correct and justified. Since the majority of the fleet is artisanal, most of the vessels do not employ crew and it's only the vessel owner that conducts work. In accordance with the definition of the DCF, vessel owners are to be considered as employees and for this reason it is justified that the number of vessels is greater than the number of jobs.

-Total KW/total GT < 1 (Inactive VL24-40 for the year 2010): An error is present. Member State is requested to check and to re-upload data if deemed necessary.

- Average length not within the length boundaries of the fleet segment MGO VL1824 and Inactive VL2440 for the year 2010 - An error is present. Member State is requested to check and to re-upload data if deemed necessary.

-Average length not within the length boundaries of the fleet segment Inactive VL2440 for the year 2011 - An error is present. Member State is requested to check and to re-upload data if deemed necessary.

-For the year 2009 for the segment PMP VL0612 – Fishing enterprises are greater than total vessels. A minor error is present and data is to be corrected and re-uploaded.

-Number of fishing days/number of vessels >365 days (for the year 2008 and for 2009 for fleet segments PMP VL0006 and VL0612) – For year up to 2009, Capacity data for small-scale vessels was taken from the FVR while segmentation for effort data was taken from the most active gear. This method was then improved as from 2010, and same segmentation for both effort and capacity is being used. Moreover for small-scale vessels, a lot of gears are used. If in 1 day, the fisher uses 3 gears, 1 day is assigned to each gear. This is the procedure used to date, since there was no workshop / agreement to do otherwise to date.

-Sea days<fishing days (for the year 2011 for the segment PMP VL0612) – This is not considered to be an error as the difference is only one day which may be due to the rounding up of decimal places.

-Days at sea/number of vessels>365 days (for the year 2008 and for 2009 for fleet segments PMP VL0006 and VL0612) – For year up to 2009, Capacity data for small-scale vessels was taken from the FVR while segmentation for effort data was taken from the most active gear. This method was then improved as from 2010, and same segmentation for both effort and capacity is being used. Moreover for small-scale vessels, a lot of gears are used. If in 1 day, the fisher uses 3 gears, 1 day is assigned to each gear. This is the procedure used to date, since there was no workshop / agreement to do otherwise to date.

-Number of trips/number of vessels>365 days (for the year 2008 and for 2009 for fleet segments PMP VL0006 and VL0612) – For year up to 2009, Capacity data for small-scale vessels was taken from the FVR while segmentation for effort data was taken from the most active gear. This method was then improved as from 2010, and same segmentation for both effort and capacity is being used. Moreover for small-scale vessels, a lot of gears are used. If in 1 day, the fisher uses 3 gears, 1 day is assigned to each gear. This is the procedure used to date, since there was no workshop / agreement to do otherwise to date.

-FTE Harmonised>engaged crew (for the year 2008 for the following fleet segments; DTS VL1824, HOK VL0612, VL1218, VL1824, MGO VL1218, PGP VL0612, PMP VL1218, for the year 2009 for the following fleet segments DTS VL1824, HOK VL0612 and VL1218, MGO VL0612 and VL1218 and DTS VL1824, for the year 2010 for the following fleet segments HOK VL0612, VL1218 and VL1824) - In the case of Malta this is correct and justified due to the fact that employees work extra hours (that is more than the 2000 hrs per year threshold) as overtime. This is therefore the reason why the number of full-time equivalent employees is larger than the number of engaged crew.

-FTE National>engaged crew (for the year 2008 for the fleet segment PMP VL1218) - In the case of Malta this is correct and justified due to the fact that employees work extra hours (that is more than the 2080 hrs per year threshold) as overtime. This is therefore the reason why the number of full-time equivalent employees is larger than the number of engaged crew.

-Landings in Landing\_fao differ from landings in Income (for the year 2008; DFN VL0006, DTS VL1824, FPO VL0612, HOK VL0006 and VL0612, MGO VL0612 and VL1218, PGPVL0006 and VL0612, for the year 2009; DFN VL0006 and VL0612, FPO VL0006 and VL0612, HOK VL0006, VL0612 and VL1824, MGO VL0612, PGP VL0006 and VL0612, for the year 2010 DFN VL0006, DTS VL1824 and VL2440, HOK VL0612, MGO VL1824 and PGP VL0006) – In the case of Malta the total value of landings is calculated by multiplying the volume(KG) by the average price per KG. The data source for the average price is derived from fish market data while data with regards to volume is derived from logbooks for vessels bigger than 10m LOA, and from the Catch Assessment Survey (CAS) for vessels under 10m LOA. On the other hand the income from the value of landings is derived from questionnaires and reflects the actual income earned from the sales of landings. Thus the different values are justified.

-Landings in Landing\_fao < 70% of the sum of landings+rights+dirtsubsidies+otherincome in Income (for the year 2008; DFN VL0006, DTS VL1824, FPO VL0612, HOK VL0006 and VL0612, PGP VL0006 and VL0612, for the year 2009 DFN VL0006 and VL0612, FPO VL0006 and VL0612, HOK VL0006 and VL1824, MGO VL0612 and PGP VL0006 and VL0612, for the year 2010 DFN VL0006, DTS VL1824 and MGO VL1824) - In the case of Malta the total value of landings is calculated by multiplying the volume(KG) by the average price per KG. The data source for the average price is derived from fish market data while data with regards to volume is derived from logbooks for vessels bigger than 10m LOA, and from the Catch Assessment Survey (CAS) for vessels under 10m LOA. On the other hand the income from the value of landings is derived from questionnaires and reflects the actual income earned from the sales of landings. Thus the different values are justified.

- Data in Effort\_fao with no vessels in Capacity (for the year 2010 MGO VL 1218) - An error is present. Member State is requested to check and to re-upload data if deemed necessary.

- Data in Effort\_fs with no vessels in Capacity (for the year 2010 MGO VL 1218) - An error is present. Member State is requested to check and to re-upload data if deemed necessary.

-Data in Landings with no vessels in Capacity (for the year 2010 MGO VL 1218) - An error is present. Member State is requested to check and to re-upload data if deemed necessary.

# Country report on data validity: POL

---

## **National total**

Reported landings volume is significantly higher than Eurostat data which can be explained by different methodology applied by Eurostat i.e. product weight is used instead live weight. Moreover Eurostat data does exclude fish landed outside EU ports, which cause that almost all deep-sea fleet catches are not reported.

Fleet capacity data are fairly the same as Eurostat values, slight differences may be explained by the fact that AER data include also that vessels which entered fisheries after January the 1<sup>st</sup> of the reporting year.

National totals match data by fleet segments. However due to confidentiality reasons deep-sea vessels had to be excluded from economic data. For the same reasons also landings values of these vessels could not be shown. Capacity and transversal data were provided for all vessels. Value of unpaid labour was not reported, methodology how to calculate this variable is in progress. Data on other income is missing for 2009, this is because of very low response rate received for this variable that year.

Data seem to be consistent across years.

## **Fleet segments**

All variables for which totals were reported are also available at segment level. In case of too small number of vessels they were merged into a larger group (clustered). This may cause some inconvenience in analyzing data across years.

## **General comments**

Deep-sea fleet is the only segment that was excluded from economic dataset. Transversal data (except for value of landings) were provided for all fleet segments.

# Country report on data validity: PRT

---

## National total

Missing variables

In 2008, only have data from MGP VL0010, AREA27, in dcf\_Capitalvalue

Data are not available at national level because don't have answers for that segment in 2008 in the survey.

Time consistency of the data

Tottraps, ingnets, tothooks and totfishopr are not consistent in the years 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011, perhaps because that data depends of the records in the logbooks (maybe incorrect/missing records).

## General comments

Only the data from 2009 have clustering.

Data from dcf\_landings only have data from note sales (in auction).

The variables Totrepcost and Totinvest, are not estimated in 2010, are the data from the answers in the survey.

The calculate of TOTHARMFTE and TOTNATFTE, are based in the number of months (because don't have the number of days) of activity in 2009 and are based in number of days of activity in 2010.

# Country report on data validity: ROU

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources

In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity

yes

Landings

yes

Economic data

yes

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

Missing variables/indicators	Missing Years	explanation
Depreciation historical	2008 to 2010	Blank : is it "0" or no data ?
Depreciation replacement	2008 to 2010	Blank : is it "0" or no data ?
Income rights	2008 to 2010	"0" : is it "0" or no data ?
Fishing rights	2008 to 2010	"0" : is it "0" or no data ?
Opportunity cost of capital	2008 to 2010	Not possible to calculate
Economic profit.	2008 to 2010	Not possible to calculate (put a blank instead of "0")
ROFTA	2008 to 2010	Not possible to calculate (put a blank instead of "0")

Time consistency of the data

2008 is not consistent with 2009-2010. But Romania has started economic data collection in 2008.

## Fleet segments

There are some segments with only one vessel in. Are Romanian rules permit to give back economical information to the Commission ?

## General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

There are some differences in GT statistics from eurostat.

Other mistakes flagged (age, landings...) are not consistent.



# Country report on data validity: SVN

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources  
In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

There is the difference between DCF and Eurostat Value of Landings data for 2008 and 2009. In the calculation of Value of Landings DCF use data on fish prices for each fleet segment separately, on the other hand Eurostat use the average price of all segments.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity – data are OK

Landings – data are OK

Economic data – data are OK

Missing variables / indicators

No variables or indicators are missing in the Slovenian data.

Time consistency of the data

All data for all requested years have been successfully uploaded on the JRC server.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

Missing indicators

No variables or indicators are missing in the Slovenian data.

Time consistency of the data

All data for all requested years have been successfully uploaded on the JRC server.

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

## General comments

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

Provided data are complete. All the indicators proposed for analysis can be estimated by using the provided data.

There was a minor difference of €0.15 between the Total landing income (DCF Income) and the Total Value of landings (DCF Landings) for the segment DFN 06-12. The difference was due to rounding values.

Economic data on the Slovenian fishing sector were collected mostly from accounting records – AJ PES, from data base, called InfoRib and through questionnaires.

The data collected from all sources are combined in such a way that a complete set of accounting items is compared for each business enterprise.

As a type of data collection Slovenia used census. The target population was all fishing sector in Slovenia.

# Country report on data validity: ESP

---

## National total

Does national totals match the information from other sources  
In case of discrepancy note the issue and give an explanation if possible.

-Eurostat data is not available.

Does national totals match the data by fleet segments

Capacity

Landings

Economic data

-Depreciation costs and non-variable costs do not match for the years 2008-2010  
Variable costs do not match for the years 2008 and 2009.

Missing variables / indicators

List missing variables / indicators and their implications. E.g. indicator not available at national level because no data for some segment.

-Depreciation historical and depreciation replacement are missing for the years 2008-2010  
Income rights is missing for the years 2008 and 2009

## Indicators

-In absence of relevant variables, Opportunity cost of capital and Return on Fixed Tangible Assets cannot be estimated.

-Operation Cash flow and Gross value added for years 2008 and 2009.

-Economic profit/loss with and without subsidies, Fixed cost, Variable costs ,BER and BERR don't match because they have not been calculated for some fleet segments.

Time consistency of the data

-Other income shows a value different than zero only in 2010.

## Fleet segments

Missing variables

List the missing variables (and give explanation if possible)

-All variables belonging to the group of Capital and Investments are missing.

-All transversal variables (related to capacity, effort and landings) are missing.

Missing indicators

List the missing variables and the reason for that (what variables missing)

-Income, Break-even revenue, Break-even revenue ratio, Fixed costs, Operating Cash Flow, Gross Value added, Economic profit/loss with and without subsidies are missing for the following fleet segments: DFN VL 0010 and VL0012 in 2010, PMP VL1824 in 2009 and 2010, PGP VL24-40 in 2008 and 2009, PS VL0010 in 2008.

Time consistency of the data

Check the data consistency in time by fleet segment totals and averages by boat.

Given that many variables and indicators are missing it was not possible to check the time consistency by fleet totals and averages by boat.

### **General comments**

General comments on data quality and validity. In specific note something that should be communicated to MS.

For almost all fleet segments, the following inconsistencies have been found:

The number of the harmonised full time equivalent is higher than the number of engaged crew.

The number of the national full time equivalent is higher than the number of engaged crew.

Even if capacity data have not been submitted, income, expenditure and employment data are present in data base.

# Country report on data validity: SWE

---

## **National total**

National totals seem to match the data by fleet segments.

Overall there seems to be time consistency of the data. Worth mentioning is that a different model specification used for the PIM-method (creating price per capacity unit) has increased the capital cost heavily. There also seems to be some inconsistency in the grouped number of enterprises over years that need to be checked.

## **Fleet segments**

All data is there and there seems to be consistency in time by fleet segment for totals and averages by boat. There are inconsistencies in the clustering for the Excel-sheet on effort on Supra region. This should not affect the results for the national chapter but Sweden has stated that new un-clustered data will be uploaded in April.

## **General comments**

Sweden has presented most of their data un-clustered and clustered just the most sensitive data (cost related data). This will increase the usability of the data for end-users and time consistency given that the data-base can handle the clustering definitions correctly combining un-clustered and clustered data. The overall impression is good and the quality is increasing.

## APPENDIX B.

### Appendix B. Correspondence from Member States explaining reasons for non-submission of data

#### 1. Greece

Dear madam/sir,

Thank you for your kind mail and help you are offering. Unfortunately, we will not submit any data further to those already submitted in the previous years. For this reason we sent a document signed by our acting General Director Ms. Marina Petrou to the Commission on 08/03/2012 to the fax number 003222979546.

As you probably know we are waiting a new legislation to pass through the parliament for awarding our National Programme to the two main institutes for fisheries research in Greece, namely FRI in Kavala and NAGREF in Athens and Creete. Hopefully, soon (before Easter), the problems we are facing will be overcome.

Best regards,  
Apostolos Karagiannakos

Sent on 21/03/2012

European Commission

EUR 25449 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: DCF Economic data call 2012 – Coverage Report.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2012 – 128 pp. – 21 x 29,7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-25747-6

doi:10.2788/39550

#### Abstract

This Data Collection Framework (DCF) coverage report was prepared by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) as part of an Administrative Arrangement with DG MARE. The purpose of the document is to provide an overview of the timeliness and completeness of the Member States data submissions to JRC in response to the call for fleet economic scientific data concerning 2008-2012 issued by DG MARE under the DCF (Council Regulation No 199/2008). Additionally, the report provides some indication of data quality, summarising major quality issues detected by JRC and the two Expert Working Groups convened under the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF).

**How to obtain EU publications**

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how to the Member States and international community.

Key policy areas include: environment and climate change; energy and transport; agriculture and food security; health and consumer protection; information society and digital agenda; safety and security including nuclear; all supported through a cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary approach.



ISBN 978-92-79-25747-6

